

DS  
755  
.S337  
1861


DUKE  
UNIVERSITY



LIBRARY







Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2017 with funding from  
Duke University Libraries



# BRITISH POLICY IN CHINA

## NEUTRAL WAR AND WARLIKE PEACE!

BY JOHN SCARTH.

“ We thwart the Deity ; and, 'tis decreed  
Who thwart His will shall contradict their own.”

*YOUNG'S Night Thoughts.*

EDINBURGH :

EDMONSTON AND DOUGLAS.

1861.





951.037  
\$ 287B

## P R E F A C E.

THE recent discussion in the House of Lords with reference to British Policy in China proves the positive necessity for further information, beyond that furnished by the Blue Books on China, for those refer chiefly to one side of the question.

Lord Elgin himself writes about the *Chinese* authorities, while he frequently alludes to the *Tartar* army. The important fact that China is ruled by a foreign Tartar power appears to be altogether lost sight of. The position of the Chinese in China may aptly be compared to that of the Italians in Venetia, or the Hungarians in Hungary; and the Chinese would as gladly see China free from a Tartar yoke, as either the Hungarians or Venetians would wish to be rid of Austrian rule. It is true that there are Chinese who serve as officers under the Tartars, but the late war has clearly proved that it is the *Tartar* government and not the *people* of China who have been our enemies. There is no reason why Chinese should not seek office under the government of their country, but that leaves untouched the fact that China is governed by a Tartar power, the Tartar Emperor having almost absolute authority.

The Chinese have no other means than that of insurrection to assert their rights. Civil war in any country is a great evil while it lasts, but in a semi-civilized country like China, where power is not tempered by mercy, the evil is increased tenfold.

I shall prove that the chief perpetrators of all the destruction and desolation in the Empire are the Imperial troops—that they are by far the most cruel.

I shall prove that there is a great deal more Christianity

among the Chinese revolutionists than is generally believed, and I earnestly beseech attention to my statements, for they relate to a subject which is of the utmost importance to the future destiny of one-third of the human race.

I court inquiry and I defy contradiction ; and, as probably there is no other person who has collected the information which I give, and who has so earnestly watched the progress of affairs in China with equally favourable opportunities of forming correct opinions, I have a right to hope that my statements will meet with attention, especially as I write solely for the cause of Christianity, the good of humanity, and for the sake of justice.

JOHN SCARTH.

MANDERSTON, BERWICKSHIRE,  
*February 23, 1861.*

## CONTENTS.

PAGE

### CHAPTER I.

NEUTRALITY DURING WAR, . . . . . 13

### CHAPTER II.

OUR NEUTRALITY WITH THE TRIAD, . . . . . 17

### CHAPTER III.

OUR NEUTRALITY WITH THE TAIPINGS, . . . . . 27

### CHAPTER IV.

THE LATE TREATIES WITH CHINA, . . . . . 49

### CHAPTER V.

OUR POLICY, . . . . . 69

### CHAPTER VI.

OPIUM, . . . . . 78

### CHAPTER VII.

IMPERIALISTS IN CHINA AND THEIR SUPPORTERS IN ENGLAND, . . . . 84

BRITISH DECLARATION OF NEUTRALITY GIVEN TO  
THE TAIPINGS.

“CERTAIN of the Mantchoo authorities had issued a proclamation to the effect that they had borrowed the services of ten or more steamers of western nations, which would proceed up the Yang-tsze to attack your forces.

“It is the established custom of our nation in nowise to interfere with any contests that may take place in the countries frequented by our subjects for commercial purposes. It is therefore totally out of the question that we should now in China lend the services of our steamers to give assistance in the struggle. In short, it is our desire to remain perfectly neutral in the conflict between you and the Mantchoos.”

SIR GEORGE BONHAM'S *Communication to the  
Insurgent Chiefs at Nankin.*

# BRITISH POLICY IN CHINA.

---

## CHAPTER I.

### NEUTRALITY DURING WAR.

THE following opinion was given by Lord Brougham in the House of Lords, July 10, 1860:—"I hold it to be no part of the law of nations to interfere in other countries to prevent the people from doing justice to themselves, from righting themselves, and from vindicating themselves. On the contrary, I hold it to be the most sacred principle of the law of nations to prevent all interference by one Power, or any combination of Powers, with the internal affairs of any other Power. No doubt there might be a strong case of exception to all rules, but it is needless to indicate what would form a case to justify a breach of the principle of non-interference, because I can hardly conceive any case which could justify it."

It would be interesting to have the same noble Lord's opinion whether or not the following would be a sufficiently strong case to form an exception to the above law:—

The Chinese Empire is governed by a despotic Tartar emperor, a descendant of the dynasty which conquered China, and usurped the throne; he is opposed to all changes. Some of his Chinese subjects wished to establish what they supposed to be a true religion, but the Government will not permit this. These Chinese, in self-defence, take up arms against the Government, are joined by the native tribes, which never submitted to the Tartar rule; they throw off the Tartar customs, and call upon all Chinese to join them in expelling the Tartars

from the country. A large army is formed by them ; they hold many cities, and set up an emperor of their own. In 1853 we find out that the new religion they wish to establish is founded upon the Holy Scriptures, that they have abolished idolatry, and publish such portion of the Bible as they possess.

We then declare our neutrality.

Subsequently, after having a war with one of the viceroys of the Tartar Emperor, we carry our forces to the province in which the capital is situated, and the Emperor refuses to hold communication with our Ambassador ; but the Tartar troops are defeated, and eventually a treaty of peace is signed. But the Emperor still refuses to see the Ambassador, who is requested to go away, and not then attempt to go to the capital, in case his presence should injure the Emperor's prestige. Such is the excuse given. The Ambassador returns home.

By and by another Ambassador is sent to the capital to exchange the ratification of the above treaty. He found that the river entrance was barred, and the forts armed ; but was told that this was merely done by the country people and militia to keep out pirates. However, suspicions are aroused, and a force is sent to open the passage ; it is fired on, and after a gallant resistance is defeated. Just before the attempt to force the passage a communication had been received by the Ambassador informing him that he might go to the capital by another route ; but this message was received too late to prevent the encounter. Our forces were attacked before orders could be sent to recall them.

After the defeat, the Ambassador and forces withdrew. The home Government was communicated with, and instructions were sent out that, if the Emperor would receive the Ambassador, and apologize for the attack on our force, nothing more would be said on the subject.

The Emperor refused to do this.

The first Ambassador was again sent out, meanwhile a very large armed force was collected in China, for the purpose of compelling the Tartar Emperor to acknowledge the treaty which had been made in his name. This force found that the

forts had been strengthened, and a large army was collected to oppose its advance.

The forts were taken, and our army advanced to Tientsin. The Tartar government then sent Commissioners to treat. A treaty of peace was arranged, but, after a good deal of time was lost, the Tartar Commissioners refused to sign it! The army then marched towards the capital; but before it got there pacific arrangements were again entered into. Meanwhile the Tartars had organized their defences; they then seized our pacific messengers who were under a flag of truce; some of them were killed, and others most barbarously tortured to death.

The Tartar army was defeated, and, to save the capital, a convention was agreed on with an Imperial Prince, the Emperor having deserted China and fled into Tartary.

Our troops were then withdrawn, and so the matter ended. The Emperor never was seen.

Though in the treaty arrangements it had been stipulated that persons teaching or professing our religion shall be entitled to protection, it came to our knowledge that, *after* the treaty had been signed in 1858 at Tientsin, the Tartar commander-in-chief had memorialized the Emperor to resist us, and, among the reasons for doing so, he gave the following:—

“ Besides, the foreigners insist on introducing their Religion, inveigling the fools, and bringing knaves to their faith, building churches, etc., whereby the precepts of Confucius may come to be despised, and the hateful foreign faith triumphant. The Chinese will thus become slaves to the foreigners.

“ Then, again, the King of the foreigners demands to be treated as equal of the Emperor, thus detracting from your Majesty’s dignity.

“ In short, the foreigners wish to debase the Chinese and exalt themselves.”

He thereupon offered to do battle with us, received the Emperor’s permission to do so, and was fortunate enough to defeat our forces at Takoo, as related above.

Though we knew in 1853 that the insurgents professed



Christianity, and though, from October 1856 to October 1860, we were more or less engaged in actual war with the Tartar Emperor and his officers, we still professed to be neutral in the civil war, and carefully avoided all intercourse with insurgents.

The rebellion has gone on for ten years, and the Tartar government is evidently quite unable to suppress it.

Would not Lord Brougham have considered this an exceptional case, and that we were justified in assisting the insurgents, at least by good counsel, if we were not in duty bound to assist them by military power?

In the following pages I shall show that we did not attempt to give them good counsel, and that we actually tried to damage their cause by an exercise of our military power, apparently in order to prevent the Tartar government from being overthrown, and thus to give some value to the treaty of Tientsin, which promised at one time to be worthless.

I entreat your full consideration to my statements, for this is the most important subject of the age, and concerns the future welfare of one-third of the human race. Surely, then, you may spare time to read this small pamphlet, especially as the honour of our country is greatly concerned.

My arguments are not based upon the propriety of our giving the insurgents other assistance than that of good counsel, and my statements are chiefly meant to show that we should not have in any way opposed them. These statements are principally confined to known facts, for which I generally give the authority from which they are derived.

In some cases I go over ground upon which I have touched in former publications, but this is only done when I require firmer foundation for my arguments.

If I attach blame to any one, it concerns the policy and not the individual, for I well know what enormous difficulties surround our diplomatists in China, especially when they are misled by erroneous information received from those whose associations and antecedents naturally influenced their judgment.



## CHAPTER II.

### OUR NEUTRALITY WITH THE TRIADS.

THOUGH the war in China is apparently at an end, and our officials have at last discovered that it was a war with the Tartars and not with the Chinese, we cannot congratulate ourselves in yet being free from the "China difficulty." Lord Elgin, by avoiding further contact with the shores of the Celestial Empire after leaving Shanghai, may free himself from new responsibilities, yet he does not release his country or himself from grave duties which should have been performed, but which as yet have been left unnoticed, or purposely passed over to hide errors committed.

Changes must soon take place in China, and in these our own country will be greatly interested: they must form no subject of mere party opinion, but must be considered of national importance. It will not suffice that the position of affairs in China is partially considered by our legislators, most of whom must confess their ignorance regarding events in that empire, but it becomes an urgent necessity, for the honour of Great Britain as a Christian nation, that they shall be fully and carefully considered, otherwise we may lose opportunities of doing incalculable good, and may perpetuate evils in which we are already very deeply implicated.

Unfortunately the late war in China was entered upon under circumstances which caused a great difference of opinion in this country regarding the justness of it, but, as the war has

been brought to a conclusion for the present, this is not a point which it is desirable to discuss. The difference of opinion, however, made the war a party question, consequently the subject was argued upon more with reference to our interest in it than with regard to the position in which the Chinese were placed. One party wished to punish the "perfidy of the Chinese Government" if the Emperor did not apologize for the attack upon our forces at the Takoo Forts, when we lost several hundred men and some vessels of war; the other party denounced the war altogether, stating that "we were making demands on the Government of China based upon disasters caused by the folly of our own minister, and which we had no right in the sight of God or man to make."<sup>1</sup> It is only remarkable, then, that the late war might have been avoided, and satisfaction given to one party, if a mere apology was made; and, as regards the party opposed to the war, it made no further opposition than words, for the supplies were voted without a division of the House. The supplies first asked for were ridiculously small, but, once being granted, the ministry had the sanction of the House to commence the war. As no apology was made, the war was carried on. It was brought to a conclusion after the allied generals had determined, on the 15th October 1860, that their armies *must leave Peking before the 1st of November*.<sup>2</sup> Nothing could induce the French general to remain after that date. Lord Elgin found that, in order to obtain a treaty, the terms must be such as would likely be accepted without demur, and, accordingly, a convention was arranged before the time when it was considered necessary that the troops should be withdrawn.

The events of the war are too recent to need recapitulation here. But it may be asked why a most expensive war should rest on so slender a thread as the mere tender of an apology? This is carrying us back into the detestable days of duels, when one man might be shot for staring at another and refusing to apologize. Is this great country to send forth its mighty

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Bright's Speech in March 1860.

<sup>2</sup> Sir Hope Grant's Letter to Lord Elgin.

armaments to the other side of the globe, and carry on war in an empire numbering 400,000,000 of people, incur all the risk and expense, for such a paltry demand? for it does not appear that the treaty made at Tientsin was entirely disowned. No; it was either a just war or an unjust war, and it will be more satisfactory to our consciences, now that it is over, to conclude that it was just. Had it not been so, and had it not in reality rested upon much more than the simple apology which has at last been made in the Emperor's name by his representative, though not by himself, I cannot doubt that it would never have been undertaken. It may be remembered that Mr. Bruce was not instructed even to ask for an indemnity, and only demanded one because the French did so.

Why did the war rest upon an apology? Why was diplomacy always anxious to bring it to a close? Why was it carried on to do as little injury to the Government as possible? Why did British subjects, under the supervision of the plenipotentiary, remain in the employ of the Government with which we were at war, collecting revenues which would assist our enemy? Why were our troops even employed to protect a city for our enemies, and fight against men who were willing to be our friends? Why were the communications sent by the latter returned unopened? The reason, I say, seems to have been this, *the Tartar power in China was so weak, it was dreaded that it might be overthrown*, and, though fighting against it, measures were taken to support it.

It was dreaded that the Treaty of Tientsin, which had been extorted from the Tartar Government, might, after all the *éclat* with which it had been received, prove to be of none effect. Even after it was made, sundry concessions were agreed to at Shanghai, when it was found that the authorities began to make objections to certain clauses, stating that "they had been agreed to under compulsion."<sup>1</sup>

The conjecture which I have given above as the probable reason for the different circumstances alluded to, may be objected to in some cases, but I shall refer to them again in order

<sup>1</sup> Elgin Mission Blue Book, p. 405.

to meet such objections as may be raised. It is advisable, in the first instance, to confine the argument to facts, and from these we may be permitted to draw conclusions.

The first great fact is this: the Tartar power in China has been threatened by a very serious insurrection. The insurgents are Chinese, who declare that they are in arms to expel the Tartars from the empire. Their chiefs further declare that their object is to overthrow idolatry, and this fact is certain that they do destroy the idols; and, besides this, they have published the Holy Scriptures in Chinese, and profess to take them as their standard of faith.<sup>1</sup>

These insurgents are headed by Tai-ping-wang, a man who had gained some knowledge of the Christian religion, and, influenced by some dreams or visions, in which he supposed that his soul had been taken to Heaven, and there received certain religious commands or revelations, he attempted to make converts to Christianity, and was so far successful that eventually the Government attention was attracted to the sect, and endeavoured to suppress it. This was resisted, and at length the rebellion began. By the voluntary assistance of some, and by the pressed assistance of others, the insurgents have

<sup>1</sup> Among those works which have given information in favour of the religion of the Taipings, are Meadows' "Chinese and their Rebellions," Callery and Yvans' "Insurrection in China," Rev. Mr. Hamberg's Account of Tai-ping-wang, taken from the statement of Hung Jin, one of the most sincere Christian converts known to the Protestant missionaries—(he went to Nankin two years ago, and joined the insurgents. He has since been made *Kan-wang*, or "Shield King"); Rev. Mr. Edkins' "Religion in China," "Christianity in China," anonymous, Dr. Taylor's "Five Years in China," Dr. Lockhart's "Medical Missionary in China," Scarth's "Twelve Years in China," and other publications.

Among those who have written against the religion of the Taipings, are Sir John Bowring, Laurence Oliphant, Sherard Osborn, and Wingrove Cooke. The chief informant of *all these* writers was Mr. Wade, who had been at one time in Tartar employ, and had great faith in the Tartar government. Even after the insurrection had actually broken out, he published a pamphlet stating that there was no "ground for apprehending that revolution was on foot within the Flowery Land." He has always been a bitter enemy to the insurgents. He has held the post of chief interpreter and adviser to Lord Elgin, and sometimes Lord Elgin has been absent for months from the advice of others than his interpreters, of those who were acquainted with Chinese affairs.

raised armies which now defy opposition, with some hopes of success.

Even suppose we admit that all the erroneous doctrines of the Taiping publications were adopted and inserted purposely wrong, we do not get rid of the fact that they have, like our missionaries, denounced idolatry, taken the Ten Commandments as the laws proclaimed from Heaven, made the Almighty their God, say that Christ is the Saviour of the world, address their prayers through Him, and teach that the Bible is the proper standard of faith. If the insurrection is suppressed, the insurgents executed, and the holders of their doctrines persecuted throughout China by the Tartar Government, what hope is there of the Protestant missionaries being able to induce the Chinese to listen to these better and really intrinsic parts of doctrines which are known to have been promulgated by the insurgents? What respect will the Chinese have for the Bible?

Besides proclaiming this new faith, the insurgents have declared that the Tartars were the great enemies of it. No doubt they are. But besides being enemies to the new faith (their attempt to suppress it accounts for the rebellion), the Tartars are looked upon by these Chinese insurgents as the natural enemies of their race, usurpers of the government, and oppressors of the people. We have had pretty clear evidence lately what the Tartars are, and what state both the government and country have come to under their rule, and we cannot wonder that the Chinese rebel against them. Within the last ten years every province has had its share in rebellion against the State.

When it became known that there was a Christian element in the revolution, *neutrality* was proclaimed by the British Government. Perhaps this was right. However, it may be doubted whether commercial and political expediency should have the preference over Christianity. I am inclined to believe that we should not have had so many political difficulties, and should have long ago possessed more commercial advantages, if the preference had been given to Christianity; at any



rate, in eight years we might have done some good, and most certainly would have prevented and avoided much evil.

The neutrality, in the first instance, merely meant non-interference; the insurgents got no benefit by it. The Tartar Government bought foreign ships, employed foreign seamen, and had the monopoly of all arms and munitions of war imported. The insurgents had sent an army from Nankin to take Peking, but, as it arrived in the north in the depth of winter, it was unsuccessful. Other insurrections broke out, and the country became much disturbed. Civil war became unpleasant to us; it began to interfere with our trade. The customs at Shanghai were put under foreign supervision, and strict regulations were enforced to prevent smuggling.<sup>1</sup> The native officials could not be trusted; some foreigners *would* smuggle, but foreign super-

<sup>1</sup> Lord Elgin intended to extend the system of foreign inspectorates to all the ports. Mr. Lay received the appointment of Inspector-General. The customs at Canton and Swatow were collected by foreigners, and it was not for some time after this was arranged that we discovered that the French were appropriating their portion of the Canton indemnity out of this source. The Americans likewise did the same, but the British—the heaviest losers—got nothing from it. In time of peace the system is probably a good one, for it secures the honest merchant; but it is quite ridiculous for the British authorities to pretend to look upon smuggling in China with honest indignation when the foreign inspectors took no cognizance of *opium*—winked at it, as it was a private source of revenue to the Mandarins before “foreign medicine” was legalized by the tariff of the treaty of Tientsin (it is not mentioned in the treaty). But, worst of all, the Tartar Government believed that we had an underhand intention in offering to collect their revenues for them *honestly*, and it was not far wrong. Sang-ko-lin-sin, in his memorial to the Emperor, says:—“Further, the custom-houses are to be placed in the hands of foreigners, whereby their ships will be exempt from examination by native officers, and charts will be made of the inner land, and munition of war will be introduced, by which much danger will accrue.” What do we do? By the conventions of Peking, we appropriate one-fifth, the French also one-fifth, of the whole revenue so collected, and thus secure our indemnity. Are we not open to suspicion in our honesty? But it costs England something too. Mr. Lay received an enormous salary from the Chinese Government; his superior, Mr. Bruce, must be paid more, so England pays £8000 a year to her Plenipotentiary, and Sir Hercules Robinson, as Governor of Hong-kong, £5000, for doing the work which Sir John Bowring in his double capacity got either £4000 or £5000 for. Then, with *two* plenipotentiaries in China,—Lord Elgin, £10,000; his brother, £8000,—besides a double staff, our expense is indeed heavy. No wonder than the Government last session declined to answer the question put to them regarding it!

intendence would prevent this, and it also assured *that all arms and munitions of war* imported were secured by the Imperial Government. Besides this, it provided for a full payment of duties to serve as the sinews of war for the Imperial army. Apart from the political state of affairs, the assistance rendered by foreigners was perfectly right ; but when the British Government supplied the Imperialists with one of the principal interpreters to act in its service in a time of civil war, in a post in which the Chinese could not be trusted, it was a breach of neutrality. There was also a decided leaning towards helping the Tartar Government to put down the different insurrectionary attempts of the Chinese. At last this grew into actual assistance ; some rebels that were not approved of by Sir John Bowring were not permitted to make blockades, their fleets were called piratical, and British ships of war hunted them out of the coast, destroyed them, acted in concert with a Chinese vessel even in a region beyond the limits where British trading vessels were permitted by the regulations to go ; and at Canton, when the rebels gave notice to the Captain of the British ship of war there that they wished to bring their vessels up that part of the river where his ship was, were informed that if they attempted to pass, they would be fired into. In all the actions excepting two, there was either no attempt to spare life, and none were saved, or else those saved were handed over to the tender mercies of the mandarins. The exceptions to which I allude were when in one case one man was reserved alive to give evidence of the guilt of the others, after they had all been killed ; and in the other case, six prisoners were taken, and six hundred men were killed. Three of the prisoners were liberated, as they were men held for ransom. There was another case where seventy-two men voluntarily surrendered before there was any action. They were taken to Hong-kong, and were classed in the gaol books as "rebels." Some, I saw, had long hair and rebel dresses. These men were all handed over to the butcher Yeh when we were at war with him. They had not even the benefit of a trial. They were supposed to be guilty of piracy and murder, but their story was

that the boats they were after belonged to the mandarins. However, as there was no trial before they were thus given up to certain death, with the probability of being cut to pieces alive, we should give the prisoners the benefit of the doubt, and only wonder that the skilful abuse of the rebels, even when this country is supposed to be neutral, has been successful in preventing this outrage being inquired into. These rebels may not, according to European notions, have deserved any political status, but are we to judge Chinese by a European standard without giving them the benefit of European laws?

Now, these events are public affairs—public records will prove them; the ship's logs will confirm some of the circumstances. I refer to the logs of the *Bittern*, the *Rattler*, the *Comus*, etc. Rebel flags were taken, the fleets were sought out, and, when hemmed in by the vessels *sent to destroy* them, sometimes opened fire in self-defence; and the action once commenced, I do not dispute the right of the British ships to carry out their mission of destruction. But I say that there was no neutrality, when, during a civil war, we took the side of the Government against any party in arms against it, protected its coasts, nay, even advertised that British ships of war would convoy Chinese vessels from one part of China to another,\*—at a time when some of these same rebel fleets actually convoyed junks on the coast, charging for the convoy, it is true, but still protecting the vessels taken from one port to another, and the only foreign merchant vessels ever proved to have been attacked by these *fleets* were one or two who were interfering with them by undertaking the charge of convoys. While all this was going on, and we were protecting the coast, and even some of the rivers, for the Imperial Government, there was scarcely an attempt made by it to protect the coast; all its vessels of war could be employed against the insurgents in the interior, and all we know of its trying to put down piracy was the taking *into its service* some of the really piratical fleets to fight against the insurgents. Public documents exist to prove this latter statement. The correspondence of the consuls at Amoy,

\* See Admiral Stirling's Proclamation.



Ningpo, Shanghai, and Foochow, cannot have failed to allude to it. The log of the "Hermes" when at Amoy will confirm it; at any rate, the work published by her Captain (Fishbourne) tells of the horrible scenes which took place at Amoy when the Imperial piratical squadron regained that place. Sir John Bowring himself has acknowledged that everything that could be done to conciliate the mandarins was done, and that if it had not been for British assistance to the Imperialists, the rebels would have taken Canton ("The Outer Barbarian," *Cornhill Magazine*, January 1860). I have no hesitation in stating that such is my opinion also. I was present at the time the city was besieged, and when nearly every other city in the province was in the hands of the rebels.

These direct acts of assistance to the Imperial Government were undertaken chiefly against the Triad rebels of the Canton province, and not directly against the Taiping insurgents; but if we assist the Government to put down one insurrection we indirectly assist it against other insurgents. I am not going to enter into a defence of the Triad rebels. If we were to believe the stories the Imperialists told against them, the only object they had in view was to murder and destroy the wealthier classes in the towns; men who had much to lose, if they had to leave their property, were no friends of the Triads; perhaps their greatest enemies were those Triads who brought them into disrepute at Hong-Kong. That colony became a refuge for the worst of them; the cowards skulked there; those who had made rebellion a trade by which to gather plunder brought their booty to Hong-Kong and Macao. Ma-chow-wang, the "king of the grass cutters," the most notorious rascal in the colony, was at one time connected with the Triads, and endeavoured to make money out of them; he subsequently acted against them, and was even employed by the mandarins against us when the war with Yeh commenced. A mean, repulsive-looking wrtch, he nevertheless gained a position of influence in the colony, and struck terror among the Chinese; he had become connected with the principal colonial interpreter, in a way which it is not necessary to state, much to the

misfortune of the Government of the colony, but eventually he was convicted of piracy, and transported. Most strenuous efforts were made by his interpreter friend to get him pardoned, but the efforts were unsueeeessful—the man was too great a rascal. I happen to know a great deal against him, more than has ever been made public, and I do not wonder that this useful villain brought into disrepute any one that trusted him. When it was known in Hong-Kong that he was made use of by any of the Triads, it was suffieient to condemn their eause ; but when he had a grudge to pay off against them he could furnish information to his friends in the Colonial Government that they were pirates, and they were treated as such. It is only fair to the rebels in the Canton province to give some evidence in their favour. They were always most friendly disposed towards any foreigner who ventured peaceably among them. The people in many places that had been oecupied by them, spoke favourably of them, and stated that they did not offer to plunder a single thing. I have been in villages which had been oecupied by them, found the houses in ruins, and most of the people gone ; those who remained attributed all the destruction to the *Imperial troops*, and in one case told us that the only loss of life at the place was among the soldiers fighting with each other for the plunder of the very places they ought to have proteeted. But I would much rather give other evidence than my own. Here is a statement of an eye-witness :

“ On a walk over Honam two or three weeks ago we passed through several burning and partially destroyed villages—destroyed because the rebels had merely marched through the streets. For one place, called Uit-tow, Hou-quahad offered the Government 40,000 taels as a ransom ; the money was taken, but the place was burnt notwithstanding. With tears in his eyes one respectable man at this same Uit-tow implored us to come in and look at the way his property had been desecrated. In one corner stood his strong money chest with the top chopped in and contents gone—every box and utensil in the house smashed open and plundered. ‘They took the shoes off my feet,’ said he, ‘and I have not a blanket to cover me when

I lie down.' For two days he had had no food, and he knew not where to get a meal, and all this had been done by the ruthless mandarin soldiery—the protectors of the people! Why, if it was deemed necessary to destroy the place, it was certainly possible to give the inhabitants time to remove elsewhere. In another village, a few days before, young women were weeping over the insults to which they had been subjected, old men had been denuded of their ears; every atrocity that man could devise had been perpetrated. Hoe Alukh in one of his proclamations has distinctly painted the character of the rulers our British Plenipotentiary would uphold. 'Wherever,' says he, 'these fiends in human shape appear, misery and rapine follow in their train. The child mourns its murdered father, the mother weeps over her ruined daughter, old men rave in madness! How can we live on the earth with such demons! Gods and men alike reject them.'

"Abreast the Barrier fort, where a large squadron of boats was stationed the last time we came from Canton, while the villages adjacent were burning, Imperialist soldiery could be seen in hundreds, each struggling along with his load of plunder to the water side. At the rate they are going, less than four months will suffice for the destruction and plunder of every village within ten miles of Canton, and then the cordon will have to be drawn closer, and, like rats in a cage, they will prey upon themselves."

Here is another statement:—"We, too, have had some means for observing the varied aspect of villages alternately under rebel or Imperialist control. There was Sun-chow. When we visited it in January (1855), as detailed in our issue of the 7th February, smiling female children were to be seen walking about without fear, and that quarter of the town in which respectable families resided was held sacred—strangers might not pass through it. We visited the same place some six weeks afterwards, and saw it again about a fortnight ago—how changed the scene!

"The rebels were, in very truth, the protectors of the people, and every one seemed happy. Under the Imperialists, the *paternal* government, not a house nor a hearth but had been

desecrated. We rambled unmolested (well armed though) through the before sacred precinct;—*thieves, in the garb of soldiers, were plundering in every direction*—not a child was to be seen, but, instead, crouched on door steps or hiding in corners, were old decrepit, helpless women, moaning in hunger and tears over the ruin which had befallen them. . . .

“So long as rebels only occupy a village or town, the inhabitants are protected and order is maintained; but the moment they leave, woe betide the luckless inhabitants! better far that they leave with the moving army, for in an hour after evacuation, the Imperialists swarm in like troops of rats, and plunder and ravage right and left. In this, however, they but follow the course ever pursued by the Tartars since they came to the country two hundred years ago;—for, as we read in the *Chronicles of Lord Macartney’s Embassy*, there was not, in that day, a single town through which the embassy passed in the interior but bore many marks of the destroying savagery of ‘the great pure dynasty.’”

I could tell how some so-called pirate fleets were rebels which levied black mail of merely two bags of rice on each boat that passed,—how some well-to-do traders have been stopped by the rebels, and only allowed to go back to the places in Imperialist occupation, after paying two hundred dollars,—how great was the anxiety of some British officers to destroy Chinese pirates, that they fired into and killed a number of passengers in a common passenger boat; but what does it matter how many Chinamen we kill; they must not interfere in any way with our trade, even though the mandarins are slaughtering them by thousands to cow them into submission to their tyrannical rule, even though they are rising for their liberties or in defence of their families. Yet if the civil war paralyses for a moment our darling trade, we must believe all the stories furnished by the mandarins’ agents to our “mandarin worshipping interpreters,” or be guided by the information picked up in the piratical dens of Hong-Kong, and actually, as Sir John Bowring has confessed, assist such a butcher as Yeh to suppress insurrection, add to his tens of thousands of victims, and, after



all, what is the result? Yeh believed that we were playing a double part, and were in reality helping the rebels; he treated our officers with greater contempt than before, and brought on a war. With all our injudicious assistance, the rebellion in the Canton province was never suppressed; it still goes on in the west and north-west districts, and is likely to spread eastward whenever the foreign troops leave Canton. What we have done, then, has merely protracted the civil war. We helped to drive away the rebels, then had to fight against the government we had assisted!

The bloody scenes witnessed when the civil war was going on, the putrid corpses that daily came floating down the Canton river, sometimes in masses of twenty or thirty tied together, and the smoking ruins of the villages, told us plainly what horrors were being enacted by the Imperial troops, whom it was our wretched policy to assist. The authorities, and the few very wealthy people, may have rejoiced at the rebellion being for a time suppressed, but the people were kept down by terror; and when opportunity offers, they will again try to overthrow the power which feeds on them like a vampire. While the rebellion was going on in the Canton province, I only knew one Chinaman who spoke in favour of the mandarins, and though a government under the Triads might even be worse than that which at present exists, the British authorities were not justified in interfering in any way, *especially when their information was derived almost entirely from the Imperialist side.*

But if the interference at Canton was unjustifiable, the acts against the Taiping insurgents were much more to be condemned.

All that was bloodthirsty or cruel on the part of either the Triad or Taiping insurgents, is entitled to the excuse, that the Imperialists set them a bad example, and were worse than either; but I have no doubt that in many cases all were bad.

Dr. Lockhart, after describing some Triad cruelties, states, "The worst cruelties of all were inflicted by the Imperialists. In their treatment of the common people also, these were by far the more oppressive, cruel, and licentious. The soldiers

would go into the villages, break open the houses, and, after plundering them, set them on fire. They would beat, and if they resisted, often kill the men, and afterwards abuse the women most foully; abusing them sometimes till they died. At times a small body of soldiers would visit a secluded hamlet for the purpose of pillage, and the men of the place, aware of their intentions, would overpower and kill them all; then a larger body of soldiers would go and burn the place. These things were of daily occurrence, until the country around Shanghai was desolated. All the large trees within a circuit of several miles were cut down for fire-wood by the troops; and the country, instead of presenting its usual fertile and flourishing aspect, was wretched and impoverished in the extreme. The soldiers were not permitted to leave the camps in large numbers at one time; and a handful of them dared not go far from the camp, or into any of the large villages, for they were so hated by the people that they would have been attacked forthwith, and driven away, most probably with loss of life.”<sup>1</sup>

Could there be stronger evidence than this to prove how erroneous, how dangerous, the whole policy of the British Government has been? We shall now further see what that policy was with reference to the Taipings.

<sup>1</sup> *Medical Missionary in China*, p. 314.

## CHAPTER III.

### OUR NEUTRALITY WITH THE TAIPINGS.

THE “foreign neutrality” which the Taiping insurgents should have enjoyed during their hard-fought battle against the Tartar Government of China has existed merely in name. National and individual acts of hostility against them have been freely manifested. The love of gain, whether it was pecuniary or political capital that was looked for, has blinded some men in their duties as citizens of the world and as Christians, and made them adopt a most dangerous policy. These are hard words to use, but facts will prove that there is only too much truth in them, and I am determined to state the case as plainly as I can. Men’s lives are at stake, and it may be that the future destiny of millions hangs upon the success of the revolution in China.

But before we notice the particular instances in which hostility has been manifested by foreigners against the insurgents, we should inquire whether there is any truth in the statement that the Taiping revolutionary leaders had some idea of Christianity, and wished to extend that religion, and overthrow idolatry in China. At present I shall not express an opinion on this point, but merely state facts which cannot be contradicted :—

It is known that the Taiping insurgents destroy the idols wherever they find them.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It is stated, that when they destroy an idol a leader cries out that they destroy it in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; then the work of destruction begins.—*Rev. Mr. Hartwell.*

It is known that the chiefs proclaim the worship of the one true God, the Supreme Ruler, the Heavenly Father.<sup>1</sup>

It is known that the chiefs declare that Christ came into the world to save sinners.<sup>2</sup>

It is known that the chiefs have published a large portion, if not all, of the Bible in Chinese.<sup>3</sup>

It is known that the chiefs published tracts and prayers for the instruction of their followers.<sup>4</sup>

There would be nothing surprising if the insurgents, without proper instruction, fell into many errors. It would be more surprising if they did not. Many statements have been made against them ; in fact, so far as some of our Government officials are concerned, they appeared to try to find out as much as pos-

- <sup>1</sup> We praise and glorify Shanghe as the Heavenly Holy Father,  
We praise and glorify Jesus as the Saviour of the world, the Holy Lord,  
We praise and glorify the Holy Spirit as the Holy Intelligence,  
We praise and glorify the Three Persons as the United True God.

Mr. Meadows' *Translation from the Taiping books.*

- <sup>2</sup> The Heavenly Father, in his vast goodness, great and without limit,  
Spared not his eldest Son, but sent him down into the world,  
Who gave up his life to redeem our iniquities.

If men will repent and reform, their souls will be enabled to ascend into heaven.

Mr. Meadows' *Translation from the Taiping books.*

<sup>3</sup> Considerable portions have been obtained from them. When Her Majesty's ships *Rattler* and *Styx* were in the Yang-tsze, in communication with the insurgents, it was reported that Taipingwang had six hundred men engaged in cutting blocks for and printing the Chinese translation of the Gospel of St. Matthew.

<sup>4</sup> Some of these were procured eight years ago. Here is the translation of one of their last :—

"Our parents, our brothers, our children, and all our relations, whether they are far or near, in foreign lands or in China, we commit them all in the powerful hand of our Heavenly Father, praying him to preserve them and give them peace, to grant them clothes and food, to keep them from calamity and hardships, to receive their souls in heaven. All that we ask is in dependence on the great merit of the redeeming death of Christ, our heavenly elder brother, on the cross. May he intercede with the Heavenly Father that his holy will may accord to us forgiveness and happiness, world without end, and bless the empire of our Lord for myriads and myriads of years."—Prayer written by the Kanwang, or shield king, whose name is Hung Jin. He is a relative of Taipingwang, and lived for several years with Protestant missionaries, studying Christianity, and was known to be a sincere Christian.



sible against them. Probably this was necessary to justify their own acts, but of this my readers shall judge for themselves.

I shall not in this place attempt to defend the religious errors of the insurgents; my argument will not prevent me from admitting as many of these as their enemies choose to find out, but as one of their leaders has lately answered many of the objectionable points eagerly seized by their Christian adversaries, it is only fair that he should be heard. The following conversation took place between this man, Lin (a chief of the 5th rank), and the Rev. Mr. Griffith John, who was accompanied by the Rev. Mr. Klockers. It occurred on the 14th November last, at the city of Tang Yang, which is in the possession of the insurgents.<sup>1</sup>

14th.—Early this morning we entered the city of Tang yang. We were introduced to Lin, a chief of the 5th rank, Húh. He received us very kindly, and promised to help us on our way on the following day. He is a Kwangsi man, and has been a follower of the Celestial King for nine years. He is a strong, healthy, robust-looking man. With him we had a long conversation on religious matters, the substance of which was as follows:—"We presume that you, like ourselves, worship the Heavenly Father and believe in Jesus." "Yes," said he, with a pleasing smile, "I believe in and worship Jesus." "The Celestial King of course does the same?" "Yes." "But does not the Celestial King call himself the Son of God?" "Yes." "What does he mean by this?" "He means that he has been appointed by God to the work of converting the Chinese from idolatry and sweeping China clean of the Tartars." Then he gave us a long account of the visions of the chief and the descent of the Heavenly Father. "Were these true visions?" "Certainly." "Are the Heavenly Mother and the Heavenly Sister real persons?" "Yes." "Is the Celestial King the Son of the Heavenly Mother?" "Yes." "But what do you mean? Do you suppose that, in the common acceptation of the term, they are the parents of the Celestial King?" "Oh, no. It is not necessary to suppose that." "Are all who worship the Heavenly Father and believe in Christ sons and daughters of God in the same sense as the Celestial King is the son of God?" "Yes; there is only the difference of degree, just as is the case with the

<sup>1</sup> The Kanwang has also replied to many questions on religious points put to him by foreigners; but as he learnt his Christianity among the Protestant missionaries, I am stating my case more fairly when I give the answers of men who were taught by Taipingwang.

fingers on my hand—some are longer and some shorter.” “Do you worship the Celestial King?” “Yes. We go on our knees and repeat the Wan Swei, wan Swei, wan wan Swei.” (May the king live ten thousand, ten thousand, ten thousand, ten thousand years—may the king live for ever.) “Do you regard the worship which you pay the Celestial King as the same as that which you present to God?” “Oh, no ; oh, no. The one is a mere court etiquette and the other is true worship, consisting of supplication and thanksgiving.” “Do you worship Christ as you worship God or as you worship the Celestial King?” “Not as the Celestial King, but as God.” “Why was the wife of the Western King called the daughter of God?” “Because she was a very pious woman.” From the above it will appear evident that *divine* honours are not paid to the chief, as has been supposed and reported by some, and that this man at least does not suppose there is anything divine about his person. All the divinity he claims for him is a divine commission.

The same reverend gentlemen, in their turn, met with another chief, who was also questioned about his religious belief—

Chun. His rank is the same as that of Lin, but his authority is at present greater. He is a Canton man. In him we have found one of the kindest and most obliging men that I have ever met with in China. It is strange how great a change comes over these Canton men as soon as they join the insurgents. Instead of insulting and despising foreigners, as they were wont to do in Canton, they are, almost invariably, the most respectful and accommodating. Our friend Chun has been a follower of the Celestial King for eleven years. He joined him at Gold Field in Kwangsi. “I am indebted to the Celestial King alone,” said he, “for the knowledge I have of the true God. I was utterly ignorant of God before I listened to the instructions of the Tien Wang.” He believes that some great change came over the chief when his soul ascended into heaven. As to the nature of the change, he could say nothing. He gave us precisely the same account of the worship paid to the Chief, as Lin had done in the morning. He spoke of the Celestial King as having been appointed by God for the accomplishment of a great work now, as Confucius had been upwards of two thousand years ago. On the doctrine of atonement by the death of Christ, he seems to hold very correct views. He spoke of Jesus as having died for all, and of our being saved by trusting in him. “The offerings which we present are thank-offerings. We did not use them at first, but afterwards they were introduced. The merit of Christ is sufficient, and no further *propitiatory* sacrifice is necessary.” “Repentance and faith are alone necessary on the part of men.” He paid marked attention to all that we told him of the divinity of Christ, the work of the Spirit, and other branches of Christian doctrine.

15th.—We were sorry to learn this morning that Chun had not been able to procure the means of conveyance for us on the previous day, and that on this account we shall have to wait another day. We had another lengthened conversation with him this morning, the purport of which was as follows:—"Do you worship Confucius?" "We regard him as having been raised by God to teach the people, and as such we read his works with respect and attention, but we do not worship him." "Would you say that the Celestial King has been sent by God in the same sense as Confucius was?" "Yes. Such is my opinion. The souls of men have all been created by God; and it is He that appoints their station—one for this purpose, and the other for that, Confucius for this task, and the Celestial King for another. Yen-Cung-wang (the King of Hades) has nothing to do with the destiny of men." "What views do you generally hold on the pre-existence of the human soul?" "We believe that they exist before birth, and that they are only variously appointed at this period." "Do you suppose that there is in heaven a distinction of sexes?" (This question was asked for the purpose of eliciting further information on the doctrine of the Heavenly mother and sister.) "I don't know. Though such a distinction pertains to this life, I know not whether it does or not in the other. The question never occurred to my mind before. Though I have read part of the Old and New Testament with the Celestial King, still, having been employed in active life for so many years, I can make no pretensions to exactness and minuteness in these matters." "Do you regard Christ as created by God, as other souls, or one with him? Three persons, one God." "I cannot explain it, but such seems to be the true doctrine. As to idolatry, the Celestial King regards it as the great curse of China; that which has demoralized it, kept it down, and prevented it from enjoying the blessings of the gospel for thousands of years. As such he hates it with perfect hatred, and is determined to banish it from the land." "Would you like to have foreign teachers among you to preach the gospel?" "I spoke of this matter to King Ching some time ago. I told him, that though the Celestial King had been establishing and teaching Christianity in China for many years, there must be many points which we do not clearly understand, and that therefore it would be well to invite foreign teachers to come and teach us more fully. The King was very much pleased to hear this. Still it would be very difficult to carry on missionary work among us at present—we have so much to do in opening up the rivers and the hills, and the people are not at rest. As soon as order is restored, the country in all its extent will be thrown open to the gospel and missionary operations. Even now, should any of the foreign brethren be willing to put up with these inconveniences, they are welcome to come and do what they can." Before leaving Chun, I marked down a few scriptural passages for his meditation. In the afternoon about a dozen common soldiers came on board our boats. The following questions were put to them:—"Whom do you worship?" "The Heavenly Father and Jesus."

"Is the Heavenly Father a Spirit?" "Yes." "How many Gods are there?" "One." "Why do you worship Him?" "Because we depend upon Him for all things." "Can you repeat the doxology?" "Yes, the old." "Do you worship the Celestial King?" "We do not." "Do the chiefs worship him?" "Yes." "How?" "By repeating the Wanswei, Wanswei, Wanswei." "Do they say anything besides?" "No."

With regard to the Divine commission, or the right divine of kings, the last European king who succeeded to a throne claims it in his first address to his subjects.—(See the King of Prussia's speech.)

It must be acknowledged that the Taiping insurgents possess no small degree of Christian knowledge. This they have derived from the translations of the Holy Scriptures, published in Chinese by the Protestant missionaries.

Now my argument is, *that if Christian nations take the responsibility of giving the Bible to the heathen, they ought also to take the responsibility to try to prevent the heathen forming erroneous doctrines from it*; and also try to induce those who will accept the doctrines to act up to the Christian standard, so that the good name of Christianity shall not become a reproach.

In fact, the greater the errors of these insurgents, the greater is the reason we should try to correct them. The British Government has taken the credit of having opened up China to Christianity, but in reality it was only in 1858 that any British treaty made mention of it in China. It is eight years since we knew that these insurgents were trying to spread their doctrines of Christianity.<sup>1</sup> What have Christian nations, and Great Britain, in particular, done in the meantime? I shall attempt to answer this question by a display of facts, but in the first place it must be noted that all foreign subjects in China are amenable only to the laws of their own country, and not to those of

<sup>1</sup> The insurgents' Book of Heavenly Rules was procured at Nankin in 1853 by Mr. Meadows, who was there in his official capacity as interpreter to Sir George Bonham. The British Government was thus placed in possession of full particulars of the insurgent doctrines. Mr. Meadows published his work on the Rebellion in 1856. It is the standard book on the subject, and should be read by all who are desirous of full information about Taiping-wang.



China. They ought, therefore, to be under control of their authorities. Great Britain proclaimed *neutrality* in the civil war. All other European nations were likewise supposed to be neutral.

The first intercourse of foreign Christians with the new sect of Chinese Christians was early in April 1853, when a number of Portuguese armed lorchas, hired by the Imperial government, attacked the insurgent fleet on the Yang-tsze Kiang at Chinkiang-foo.

After this the Imperial authorities bought several English and American vessels, armed them with foreign guns, manned and officered them with English and Americans. When H.M.S. "Hermes," with Sir George Bonham on board, passed up the river to go to Nankin for the purpose of explaining to the insurgents our intention to be neutral, and that the mandarins' reports that they had hired British ships of war and steamers to fight the Taipings were false; the Portuguese lorchas, the above-mentioned foreign vessels, and the rest of the Imperial fleet, took the opportunity to follow Her Majesty's ship, and cannonaded the Taiping positions. *This was the first intercourse of Protestant Christians with the new sect of Chinese Christians.*<sup>1</sup>

As the "Hermes" was proceeding up the river in such suspicious company, and as the insurgents most probably had information of the Imperial proclamations, stating that British steamers had been hired by the Tartar government, it was very natural that they should open fire, which they did, fortunately without effect, on the "Hermes," and it is highly creditable to Sir George Bonham and Captain Fishbourne that the "Hermes" did not return the fire, but passed on to Nankin, the Imperial fleet meanwhile keeping up the engagement at a respectable distance.

Some people have said that the insurgents adopted Christianity in order to curry favour with foreigners; the above events will serve to disprove this. It was not at all generally known at the time that the insurgents had any elements of Christianity in their doctrines.

<sup>1</sup> Meadows, *The Chinese and their Rebellions*, page 210.

When the "Hermes" reached Nankin, a few shots were fired at her from a battery, but whenever a boat was sent in with a letter explaining her peaceful intentions, neutrality was declared, and friendly intercourse at once begun. Mr. Meadows' statement was listened to by one of the principal chiefs, who soon commenced questioning his foreign visitor about his religious belief, and when he found out that we had the Ten Commandments as our Heavenly Rules, he exclaimed, "The same as ourselves! the same as ourselves!" "He then stated, with reference to the previous inquiry as to their feelings and intentions towards the British, that not merely might peace exist between us, but that we might be intimate friends."<sup>1</sup>

Much valuable information was obtained during the "Hermes" visit to Nankin, where she remained some time, but Sir George Bonham unfortunately did not visit the chief, Taiping Wang, though arrangements were made for an interview. This chief, who claims the title of Emperor of China, had, like all Chinese, the notion that the Emperor of China was the king of all the world, and his chiefs accordingly addressed Sir George Bonham by letter as if he represented a subordinate sovereign.<sup>2</sup> Instead of any attempt at *explanation* being made, Sir George Bonham

<sup>1</sup> Meadows' *Chinese and their Rebellions*, page 259.

<sup>2</sup> To show the Tartar Emperor's opinion on the above point, I give here a translation of a document found in the palace of Yuen-ming-yuen, and sent home by Lord Elgin.

"(Translation.)

"DRAFT of an IMPERIAL RESCRIPT in Vermillion, that is, in Autograph, found in  
"the Palace of Yuen-min-yuen, on the 7th October 1860:—

"We have this day perused the reply of the American barbarians to the communication of Kweiliang and his colleagues.

"[It shows that] in the matter of their presentation at court nothing more can be done to bring them to reason. (1.) Besides, these barbarians, by their averment that their respect for his Majesty the Emperor is the same as that they feel for their pih-li-si-tien-teh (President), just place China on a par with the barbarians of the South and East; (2.) an arrogation of greatness which is simply ridiculous. The proposition of yesterday, that they should have an interview with the Princes, need not either be entertained."

"(1.) Lit. There cannot be any more good means for bringing them round (to the right way). Argument is exhausted, so let the question of an audience drop.

"(2.) The Miran, ancient barbarians of the South—the I of the East."

Are the Tartars better than Taiping Wang?

replied in a short letter, stating that his nation had a treaty with the Chinese (Tartar) government, and the right to trade at five ports, and "if you or any other people presume to injure, in any manner, the persons or property of British subjects, immediate steps will be taken to resent the injury in the same manner as similar injuries were resented ten years ago, resulting in the capture of Chin-Kiang, Nankin, and the neighbouring cities." Unfortunately Christianity was smothered by our self-importance; we made no attempt to correct an error. Nankin was never captured by us, nor were any of the "neighbouring" cities, with the exception of Chin-Kiang. The treaty of peace was signed at Nankin, but the city was not taken; the men in possession were probably quite aware of this.

I have seen what the Chinese consider to be their best map of the world;<sup>1</sup> it is a large square, *all* "China," except a few islands, some very diminutive and separate from each other. In one corner are marked "England," "Portugal," "France," &c., and there is a little one meant for Africa, but called the "country of the black devils." That is the Chinese notion of the world. Taiping Wang probably knew no better than other Chinese or Tartar Emperors, who have always believed that they were the real sovereigns of the world. It may be remembered that Mr. Parkes found, when he was in prison, that he was classed under the title "rebel," as if foreigners hostile to the state were actually in rebellion; poor fellow! what a shock this must have been to him. I was with him once in Canton where we saw sixty-three men beheaded, because they were *called* rebels. Our *dictated* treaties will not alter the Chinese idea of geography, and I will venture to assert that nine-tenths of all the Chinese and Tartars believe that the man who governs China is sovereign of the world. However, at Nankin no explanations were given on this point, and, strange to say, Sir George Bonham's letter did not even contradict it! He left immediately.

The peaceful intentions of the insurgents at Nankin do not appear to have been made generally known among their forces; for when the "Hermes" was passing down the river some batteries at

<sup>1</sup> There is one in Messrs. Dudgeon & Co's. office, New Bank Buildings, London.

Kwa-chow, on the opposite side, opened fire: this she returned. On arriving off Chin-Kiang some shots were also fired at her, upon which she sent forty or fifty round shot and a few shell into the place, then anchored two miles distant. In a very short time a letter was brought down to her, and the General in command explained that the fire had been opened at Kwa-chow by mistake, by some new troops, who were *not aware of our having been in peaceful communication* with their Princes at Nankin. On hearing the noise of the firing at Chin-Kiang, he had hurried down to prevent it. Mr. Meadows told the General that "we were still willing to continue neutral; but that all acts of aggression would be repelled by force, and might compel the British Government to side with the Mantchoos. He (the General) asked why we, who had an old enmity with the Mantchoos, and were, on the other hand, brethren of his party, *inasmuch as we acknowledged the same God and Christ*, did not rather aid the latter?"<sup>1</sup>

So the "Hermes" left the insurgents without doing any real good, or correcting a single error; she brought away information, and satisfied curiosity.

Mr. Meadows subsequently returned to Chin-Kiang, and was favourably received; he had been sent to look after some sixty men, who had been inveigled by the Imperialists to desert into their service from British ships, under promises of high pay. Dr. Taylor (the author of *Five Years in China*) made a bold excursion to Chin-Kiang, and remained with the insurgents three days. He was "very favourably impressed with them," and joined with them in worship. He brought away a letter addressed to the foreign authorities, stating that as the Imperialists took advantage of foreigners passing up the Yang-tsze Kiang, to make attacks on the insurgent position, it would be better that they deferred visiting them until peace was restored. Dr. Taylor did good, for he took copies of the gospels with him, and acted, too, in his medical capacity.

In December 1853, the French war steamer "Cassini" went to Nankin, and, though the insurgents at Chin-Kiang could see

<sup>1</sup> Meadows, *The Chinese and their Rebellions*.



her being saluted by the Imperialist admiral's flag-ship (*an English brig*), in the blockading fleet, and knew that she remained with that fleet all night, yet there was not a shot fired at her either at Chin-kiang or Kwa-chow, though she passed both batteries within close range, and never even sent in to communicate. But when she steamed up to Nankin, *one* shot was fired at her. This was at once apologized for as the mistake of a subordinate. No further difficulty occurred; but I question if the visits of the French priests did any good.

The U.S. S.S. "Susquhanna" went to Nankin in May 1854. She, too, was saluted by, *and saluted* the semi-foreign Imperial fleet blockading the river, and then passed up close to the insurgent batteries. A shot was fired across her bows, the steamer *stopped*, and at once cleared for action to avenge the *insult*. However, a boat was sent on shore, and "the General stated that the shot had been fired because they found it necessary to stop all vessels ascending the river; but now that the friendly character of the ship was ascertained, proper instructions would be given to the officers at the batteries to prevent a recurrence of it." He was told that the ship would go on to Nankin. To this he replied, that it would be much better if the ship would remain until the intended visit could be made known at Nankin. Then the Americans wrote a letter demanding an ample apology for the *insult* that had been offered, and threatened that they would destroy the battery! A satisfactory apology was sent, but the General still hoped that the ship would wait till notice had been sent to Nankin. However, she went on. The officer in command at Kwa-chow sent off a boat to request that the steamer would not go on until he had time to send to Nankin. However, she still went on. She beat to quarters on arrival at Nankin, and made every preparation to "send a broadside" into the crowd that had collected to look at her, in case any hostile demonstration had been made. Fortunately there was none, and friendly intercourse went on.

Now all this is clearly forcing a blockade; and when it is remembered that the only means of communicating with the

insurgents by the Americans was through missionaries, who acted as interpreters, I cannot understand how these men of God did not threaten to withhold their services, unless a more honourable and Christian-like mode of proceeding was adopted. No thanks, then, to the foreigners that lives were not lost; the insurgents alone are worthy of the credit that may be due for this.

Two of Her Majesty's steamers visited Nankin in June 1854, and brought away further information about the insurgents; but no good was attempted to be done, though the errors of the insurgents' doctrine, and their ignorance, appeared to be as great as ever. Our duty as Christians was lost in our supposed duty as critics. Ignorance was called blasphemy, and the insurgents were left for *four years and a half* to their own devices. Their cause was supposed to be falling, and perhaps that was the real reason why we would have nothing to do with them. Meanwhile our officials tried to "conciliate the mandarins" as much as possible. Then we had the quarrel with Yeh, the fight at Takoo, and the treaty of Tien-tsin.

The *Christianity* of the rebels was thought nothing of, but, for the sake of *commerce*, Lord Elgin made an expedition up the Yang-tsze Kiang.

Notwithstanding the experience of former expeditions past the insurgent lines,—notwithstanding that, since the last Government steamers had been at Nankin, *foreign steamers bought by Chinese* had been engaged in fighting against the insurgents there,—notwithstanding that Mr. Meadows distinctly stated in his work (which was the best work Lord Elgin could have consulted) that one of the chiefs had told him that it was necessary that boats should be sent ahead to prevent foreign vessels being fired on when they came with a peaceful intention,—still Lord Elgin advanced with his fleet, *out of the Imperial flotilla*, up to the insurgent batteries, sending one small steamer in front, but not sending any boat in to communicate. Of course, they were fired on, a shot being sent over the small steamer. She then hoisted a flag of truce, but still went on, more shots following, when she did not send a boat or stop.

It will be remembered that, when the "Susquhanna" stopped and lowered a boat, all firing ceased. All the fleet, with Lord Elgin, engaged the batteries, silenced them, *returned next day* to punish them again, and, although they "scarcely ventured to reply," gave them broadside after broadside to destroy them ! the Imperial fleet waiting close by to come up. There was no attempt to communicate with the insurgents, and, even by the published instructions of Lord Elgin, we find that he it was that was desirous that the insurgents should communicate first. The people who were forcing the insurgents' blockade were not even to offer to send a communication before doing so ! Now, what does Lord Elgin say himself, when, *after* his trip, he wrote to Sir M. Seymour on 6th January ?<sup>1</sup> "I told the rebel authorities that our vessels of war would probably pass and repass from time to time during the winter. They requested that notice might be given to the garrison when they were about to pass, in order to prevent mistakes. *This is a reasonable request*, as the Imperialists might otherwise take advantage of the immunities accorded to our vessels to pass the rebel lines" ! !

In Lord Elgin's case, the small steamer *had passed* all the batteries unchallenged ; but by this time the insurgents could see all the other large steamers "passing through the fleet of Imperialist junks which formed the advanced position of the force then investing Nankin. The crews of these vessels were watching our proceedings with breathless interest."<sup>2</sup> No doubt the insurgents were doing the same ; and when they saw that the small steamer had gone past without attempting to communicate, and a number of other steamers, evidently friends of the Imperialists, were coming on, it was not surprising that they attempted to resist the passage. However, the act of these men, who were fighting for their lives, and had a right to some consideration from a declared *neutral* power, was considered to be "impertinence,"<sup>3</sup> and the punishment of impertinence, ac-

<sup>1</sup> Elgin Mission Blue Book, p. 455.

<sup>2</sup> Oliphant's *Lord Elgin's Mission*, vol. ii. p. 310.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 311.

cording to our naval law, as studied by those responsible for the acts committed, appears to have been DEATH ! Our ships, they said, were going up the river in exercise of a treaty right. Said treaty was *not ratified* till nearly *two years afterwards*, and even then it contained a stipulation that our ships were NOT TO go up the Yang-tsze Kiang until the insurgents had been driven away by the Imperialists.<sup>1</sup> It may be said that this only applies to merchant vessels, but, without our ships communicating, how were the insurgents to know the difference between ships of war and trading vessels ? Besides this, how were the insurgents to know anything about the treaty or our new treaty rights ? The simple fact is, Lord Elgin had a mandarin on board,—that was not neutral, to begin with,—and the two chief advisers who accompanied his Lordship, though Englishmen, had both been in the Imperial service ; in fact, one was even then in Imperial pay ! On the second day of the fight, when the fleet returned to punish the “impertinence,” the attack was begun by our vessels, who went for the express purpose of “hammering the forts into ruins, and their garrisons into submission.”

Was this neutrality ? Firing into them for *an hour and a half*, during which time only one shot struck our vessels ; and the engagement was only concluded by our ships withdrawing when they saw the Imperial fleet, “*led by a steamer*,” coming up to join in this *gallant* action !

The next act of the *neutral* fleet was again to attempt to pass more insurgent batteries without communicating, though the insurgents, at five hundred yards’ distance, fired off small arms from the open field, but, as the steamers still went on, they repaired into a fort and fired a large gun. The neutral squadron then shelled them out of the fort, “*those of its occupants who were still alive*” making off. Resistance there was none, yet, as a crowd had collected, “*watching the proceedings*,” “we sent them a ten-inch shell, just to give them some idea of our armament !”<sup>2</sup> Mr. Oliphant calls this “a little episode !”

<sup>1</sup> “I have clearly no title to go up the river as a matter of right.”—Lord Elgin’s Despatch, *Blue Book*, p. 440.

<sup>2</sup> Oliphant’s *Lord Elgin’s Mission*, p. 318.



At the next place visited by the neutral fleet, the insurgents informed the officers that the firing at Nankin was a mistake ; and, when the steamers arrived at a well-fortified gorge, " we congratulated ourselves that the garrison had received orders to confine themselves to staring at us." Further on they came to a large city, held by the insurgents, and *then* " Mr. Wade was sent on shore, to open up communications with them, the chief object of his mission being to obtain supplies. Our Chinese official was, of course, invisible on these occasions, as an Imperialist in the heart of the rebel country."<sup>1</sup> The insurgents, when thus communicated with, were found to be " anxious to do all in their power to show us civility." They sent a special messenger off to the ships to inquire what was the reason of their visit. Such supplies as were required *were furnished*.

The Retribution was left at the Imperialist town of Kewhsien ; and all the information obtained there was naturally adverse to the insurgents. Mr. Oliphant takes advantage of this to malign them as heartily as any Tartar could do.

Further on, the rest of the fleet fell in with an Imperial squadron. Application was made to it for beef—herds of cattle being visible on shore. The beef was promised, but *never sent*. At Nganking, the capital city of Nganwhui, they found the Imperialists advancing on it. The engagement had begun. The *country people* were flying, with all their moveable property, *into the city held by the insurgents*. The advancing Imperialists were burning the hamlets as they came up to them. " It seemed that the Government troops had received notice of our approach, and had determined to take advantage of it, in order to make a grand attack upon Nganking." What did the neutral fleet do? It advanced by the river parallel with the Imperial army, though " we knew that it was impossible" that the news of the Nankin *episode* had reached Nganking. There was no attempt to communicate. The insurgents seeing the fleet advancing in company with the attacking Imperialists, fired a shot at it. " The smoke of

<sup>1</sup> I still quote from Mr. Oliphant.

the first shot had not cleared away from the muzzle of the gun before the well-known flag which heads the list of British signals was flying from our mast-head, and the Furious, Cruizer, Dove, and Lee, had opened in full chorus." Of course the insurgents were driven out of their redoubt by this specimen of *neutrality* into the very jaws of the Imperialists. Mr. Oliphant goes on to say, "At this time the general effect was in the highest degree exciting and picturesque. The hurrying of bodies of men to and fro over the fields,—the waving of flags and firing of gingalls,—the thunder of our own heavy guns,—the groups of *country people* hastening across the drawbridge *into the city for refuge*, staggering under heavy loads and driving cattle before them,—*the smoke of their burning homes* rising up to the cloudless sky,—all combined to form a scene to gaze upon which, as it lay mapped out beneath, must have stirred the heart and sent the blood tingling through the veins of the most unimpassioned nature—it is so seldom that we experience emotions which invite in themselves at one and the same moment the highest amount of æsthetic and animal excitement." No thought of neutrality!—no thought of Christian duty!—no thought of justice! It is thus that the Chinese are treated. The story is well written. We look upon it as one would view a tragedy in a theatre, but forget that the *bloodshed is real*! It was for such Christian-like excitement as this probably that Mr. Oliphant joined the filibuster Walker, who was shot, without pity, because he was unsuccessful; but as our neutral fleet was *successful*, there has not been even a court-martial! Yes, though they saw the poor country people burned out of house and home, and rushing into the rebel city for protection, these poor wretches got no pity even from those who appear to have looked upon the insurgents as savages. Pity!—No, the neutral fleet left the place "after bursting a shell or two in *the streets* as a warning." How many of the poor country people they killed they did not stay to inquire!

On Lord Elgin's return down the river to this place, he was not prepared to fight in this questionable way again, for he had been forced to leave his large ships behind, and come down



in a gunboat. *Then* the proper plan was adopted to prevent any conflict. He sent in a small boat with a message, and the messenger was received in a most friendly way, and they passed in peace, without having an excuse to send any more shells into the city. The message given by Mr. Wade was a threat instead of a peaceful overture; so there was an attempt to bully them, though we were not in a position to fight. The insurgents said, that after the ships had passed on their way up, some Canton men had discovered that the flag was a foreign one, and a mistake had been made in firing. They parted on this occasion good friends.

The expedition eventually all got back to Shanghai without again having an excuse to fire upon the insurgents.

One of the chiefs at Nankin received Mr. Wade and some of the officers in a friendly manner, and apparently wished to discuss religious matters, as he recurred to the subject, "beginning again and again." This did not suit Mr. Wade's ideas; and though the party was invited to remain all night, and a number of the new publications of the insurgents were promised to be given them next day, they could only spare a "quarter of an hour"<sup>1</sup> for the interview with the chief. Thus they have given a clear proof how little anxiety they felt about any religious element in the insurgent doctrines. After all that the fleet had done, it would be inconvenient to have anything favourable to tell of them, so they were not listened to; and neither does Lord Elgin, Mr. Oliphant, nor Mr. Wade, in what they have written on the subject, ever express any regret that the semi-Christianity of the insurgents was passing away; that this great movement might wither and die out, leaving all its dangerous traces behind to keep Christianity out of China for generations to come; and so thoroughly Imperialist were our officials taught to be, they might rather rejoice at this attempt at Christianizing China proving an utter failure, than do anything to put it in the right course.

No further attempt was made to go near the insurgents. Their cause was looked upon as hopeless; at least so we would infer from all that Mr. Oliphant, or others who have written

<sup>1</sup> Elgin Mission Blue-Book, page 451.

about the expedition have stated : they all looked through the Imperial spectacles of Mr. Wade and Mr. Lay, and it is their story that we hear.

Early in 1860 the insurgents began to show that they were anything but defeated ; they attacked the important city of Hang-chow, so as to induce the Imperialists to detach part of the besieging force from Nankin to its assistance ; and this being done, the garrison of Nankin utterly routed the remainder, the Imperial soldiers rushing off in a disorganized state towards Soochow, one of the largest cities in China. Instead of making a stand there, they mutinied, killed some of their officers, *and sacked the place*. The insurgents followed soon after, took possession, and have held it ever since without opposition !

They also took most of the other cities in the same province, and sent an army to occupy Shanghai. Proclamations were posted up threatening the people with death if they resisted, but stating that if they submitted to them at once, "not a fraction shall be exacted from you." Previous to this the British and French ministers had agreed to defend Shanghai for the Imperialists. They occupied the city, and took precautions to protect the foreign settlement. Meanwhile, Protestant missionaries and others had visited the insurgents at Soochow, and were surprised to find that, far from the religion of their chiefs having fallen away, it was greatly strengthened, and they discovered that one of the principal chiefs proved to be a man who had been brought up in the Protestant missionary establishments, and was known to be the most sincere convert the Protestants could boast of. In fact, it was *at his invitation* that two of the missionaries went to Soochow.<sup>1</sup>

Some of the insurgent publications were brought away ; they proved *to be wonderfully correct, so far as Christian doctrine* was concerned, and it was found out that the insurgents had nearly the whole Bible in Chinese. This quite stultified all the Imperialist accounts brought from the Yangtsze-kiang by Lord

<sup>1</sup> As the *Times* has stated that the Taipings never asked for missionary advice, I may state that I got this information in a Report of the Shanghai Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

Elgin's expedition. Mr. Bruce, his brother, soon afterwards caused a notification to be issued, that British subjects should not "hold intercourse" with the insurgents, as it would be a "violation of international principle," if they did so before the British Government "*acknowledged the insurrectionary movement.*" Yet at the time we were at war with the Imperialists, and Mr. Bruce's reason for issuing the notice was because the Imperialist authorities asked him to do so, as the rebels might get arms.<sup>1</sup>

At this time foreigners had been visiting the silk districts, purchasing silk, and bringing it to Shanghai. The insurgents did not interfere with this business, and permitted the boats to pass. On one occasion they made the gentleman in charge of a considerable quantity of silk give up his arms; but they did not tax the silk, and, to prevent future dispute, called upon the foreigner to place a value on the weapons seized, and paid him for them. They have since imposed taxes on boats passing with silk through their districts. It was no doubt very kind of the authorities at Shanghai to warn British subjects not to hold intercourse with the insurgents when the Imperial authorities said that it might be dangerous. In the notification alluded to, Mr. Bruce says: "I am not aware that, under the existing treaty, foreigners are entitled to carry goods of any kind up the country for traffic." The same remark would apply to foreigners bringing goods from the interior; but immediately after the Imperial authorities had secured the assistance of foreign troops at Shanghai, and *an actual collision* had taken place with the insurgents, and being thus *assured* that the foreigners were opposed to the insurgents, *then* they sent notice to the consul, pointing out the best route into the silk district—thus encouraging foreigners to go into the interior, no doubt in hopes that the insurgents, after their defeat at Shanghai, would attack any foreigners they met with in the interior, in which case there might be some prospect of bringing foreign troops into the interior to fight against the rebels. The British authorities *then* gave publicity to this

<sup>1</sup> Consular Notification, Shanghai, 8th August 1860.

notice of the Imperialists, so that when it suited the Imperialists to keep us back, notice was given that we ought not to go ; and when the Imperialists thought to gain some advantage by our going into the interior, then notice was given how we should go. The notice was ostensibly to show the route which was free from the insurgents ; but then it was well known that they were moving about the country, and must cross the very track pointed out by the Imperial authorities !

Before the insurgents advanced on Shanghai they sent despatches to the foreign authorities informing them of their intention, and that no harm need be feared by foreigners. Mr. Bruce refused to receive the despatches, and they were returned unopened. A notice was sent by the foreign military authorities two days before the insurgents appeared at Shanghai, warning them not to approach the place, as the allies intended to defend it ; but this notice was sent to the wrong place, and WAS NOT DELIVERED, *but brought back to Shanghai* ; and the first notice the insurgents had of the foreigners' hostile intentions was, whenever "they came near enough to be fired upon with effect with canister and smooth-bored muskets," the British troops began the attack.<sup>1</sup>

There is not a word of the insurgents ever having fired a shot. Letters from Shanghai state that when they subsequently sent forward a flag of truce, it was fired upon by the French. I have seen letters from Shanghai speaking of the acts of the allies as "gross injustice," "cruel murder." The French burnt the best suburb of the place. It was feared that the Chinese would rise in favour of the insurgents ; the "loyal Chinese" were said to have fled, and those who remained had been buying arms. Were we then to prevent the Chinese joining the revolutionists ? Whenever and wherever the insurgents appeared, they were fired upon, and at last they withdrew. While before Shanghai, they passed foreigners through their ranks, the only pass-word required being, "We worship the Heavenly Father." Yet shot and shell and rifle-balls were fired on the masses of the revolutionists at intervals, from nine

<sup>1</sup> *Vide* Colonel March's despatch to Sir Hope Grant.



in the morning of the 20th August, till two in the afternoon, they standing unresisting and unoffending.<sup>1</sup>

Two days *after* they were driven away, the old notice of the 16th August was sent out to them by a messenger with a solitary orderly as guard. He was received most kindly, and a despatch was returned by him to the British authorities, stating, as clearly as words could express it, that they had no wish to be opposed to foreigners who worshipped the same God as themselves—that they came to Shanghai willing to be friends with them, and ready to make a treaty with them, so as to carry on commerce freely. I am not aware if any answer was given, but Mr. Bruce has acknowledged, in his conversation with Prince Kung, that had it not been for our assisting the Imperialists to hold Shanghai, the insurgents could have readily taken it, and been able to secure the whole province, and that their letters were “*couched in a friendly spirit.*”<sup>2</sup>

Never was there a more flagrant breach of neutrality committed than that at Shanghai. I need go no further to prove how cruel, how unchristian-like has been our whole policy with regard to the revolutionists. We may be placed in the same position over and over again: is our plenipotentiary still to be guided by a policy intended to support the Tartar dynasty, and is Great Britain, the bulwark of the Protestant faith, to do nothing but oppose those Chinese whose leaders wish to establish Christianity in that vast empire? I do not hesitate to state that had the insurgents received as much assistance from the British as the Imperialists did, and had proper counsel and advice been given them, China would now have been in peace instead of in anarchy, and be ruled by a Christian instead of a pagan emperor.

Not only was direct assistance given to the Imperialists by the allies, but there was indirect foreign assistance given to enable them to establish Shanghai as a safe place for the government of the province. When the army was defeated before Nankin, the Governor-General fled to a town on the north

<sup>1</sup> *Vide* Colonel March's despatch to Sir Hope Grant.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Bruce's Letter to Lord John Russell, 16th Nov. 1860.

side of the Yang-tsze Kiang ; but when it became known that the allies would protect Shanghai, a steamer, bought by the Imperial Government, but officered and manned by foreigners enticed by high pay and want of principle, was sent to bring him to Shanghai. He established his seat of government there, troops were collected under the protection of the allies, expeditions were sent out even against places where the people had risen in favour of the insurgents, foreigners were enlisted, and a corps, consisting chiefly of Manillamen and Portuguese, was sent off to fight against the insurgents. An American bargained for a certain sum to take a place held by Taipings troops : he was defeated. Men supposed to be insurgents were seized and executed at the camp at Shanghai, while the city was garrisoned by the allies ; and lately, when a large body of native troops were collected there, the chief British military officer told the authorities that they should be sent to another city, as they were under such wretched control, and, when they did arrive at their new station, they took to plundering the people. While the country was thus disorganized, every atrocity was put down to the Taipings, but when inquired into, it was generally proved that they were not to blame. Even when they came to Shanghai it was remarked that, when they took up their stations, they avoided injuring *the crops, and camped on vacant land*. When sometimes they were found moving from one station to another in the interior, a small party of ten or twenty men were found moving about *alone*. Now, had they had anything to dread from the people, would they have thus ventured ? It is sickening to see the mention of British troops acting in concert with the ruffian Imperial soldiers at Shanghai ; and the great danger is, that by thus helping the tottering Tartar power, we prevent the people taking any active part in the quarrel, and thus prolong the misery which a civil war must always occasion in such a country as China. When we know what sort of government the Tartar Government is, why do we protect it ? Could we *pray* for its success ?



## CHAPTER IV.

### THE LATE TREATIES WITH CHINA.

PRINCE KUNG, in one of his letters to Lord Elgin, says "that the insecurity of peace, as negotiated during many years past, has been entirely owing to the fact that peace has always been negotiated in presence of an armed force, and that it has been impossible to have explanations of the different conditions of the treaty, article by article. The consequence has been doubt and suspicion on both sides." The convention of Peking was not different from previous treaties in this respect; it was signed while Lord Elgin had a guard of 500 men, and an army stationed close by in position, ready to act if occasion required. Litters for the wounded were actually brought out with the forces who were stationed to protect the Plenipotentiary at the Hall of Ceremonies, where the treaty of peace was signed! But what do we know of this Tartar Prince, Kung, and how are we to rely on the promises and conditions he has signed? On the 24th September he writes to Lord Elgin that the British officers so treacherously captured were "in the capital. None of them have suffered *harm*."<sup>1</sup> Now the fact is, that *at this time* Parkes and Loch were the only British officers in the capital, and they had been most barbarously treated. Mr. Loch at the time was in the common prison, among the worst felons, and chained by his neck to a beam. *At this time* Captain

<sup>1</sup> Such is the translation Mr. Wade gives in the text, but a note is added stating that it might mean "*mortal injury*." In the same way, to put the best construction on the letter, he translates that the officers will be sent back "such as they shall find them to be." To this Mr. Wade puts a note: "This is a mere formula, which might be almost as well untranslated. It might be rendered *all in good order*." I will give Mr. Wade full credit for this, as he no doubt desired to give hope to friends at home; but he put too much faith in Prince Kung."

Brabazon and the Abbé de Luc must have been dead. *At this time* all the other officers and many of the men were under most excruciating torture, the maggots eating into their flesh ; and Mr. Parkes and his unfortunate companions, who were “in the capital,” would probably have suffered the same fate had it not been for the kindness and sympathy shown them by the poor Chinese prisoners, who loosened their bonds, fed them, and even eased off the weight of their chains. If anything should have made our chiefs sympathize with the Chinese, and hold the Tartars in just abhorrence, it was this. But no ; there is still that futile argument, “We cannot *afford* to overthrow the Tartar Government.” On the 27th September, the prince, in a letter in which he states that “in his conduct towards men the prince is sincere,” he says, “As regards the capture by our army, in the confusion of the fight, of the British officers returning from Tung-chow, it is true that the former commissioners did seize them, bind them, and confine them ; but the prince, when this came to his knowledge, which was but recently, gave orders to the officer in charge to release them from confinement, to lodge them comfortably, to attend to the hurts of those that were wounded, and to treat them with every courtesy. In evidence of the prince’s sincerity towards man, he is bound, before he does anything else, to oblige the British Government to put away utterly its suspicions, and he now encloses the card sent by the consul Parkes to his excellency Hang, that it may be known that this person is safe and well, and has come to no harm.” For two days *after* this (on the 29th) Mr. Loch was still in chains ; they were then removed. It was not till five days afterwards that the sowars had their chains taken off. It was on *this very day* that poor Anderson died, after his nails and fingers had burst from the tightness of the cords, which had never been slackened for at least seven days. *Five days* after this, one of the sowars died in the same horrible state, and it was not till three days after this, or *eight days* after the *sincere* Prince Kung thus wrote, that poor De Norman was released by death from his sufferings. Yet the deception was still carried on for two weeks after the date of Kung’s letter

of the 27th ; and though some of the prisoners were at a distance from Peking, it was within two days' journey, and he could not plead ignorance of the state in which the prisoners were. Some had their chains taken off on the 29th September, others not till about the 2d October. Those who did survive owed their lives to those Chinese who were prisoners with them. One of the sowars says, " The Chinese prisoners were very kind to us ; cleaned and washed our wounds, and gave us what they had to eat."

Prince Kung even made use of Mr. Parkes' note to act a part of the lie he was perpetrating, though the note was written from the common prison just when his chains were first removed. The prince even got Hang-ki to try to induce Mr. Parkes to write a lie, saying that Prince Kung had been exceedingly kind to him.

If such is the character of the man with whom Lord Elgin made the treaty, what is the worth of that treaty ? It is said that the Emperor agrees to it, and ordered it to be published and posted up in Peking ; but Prince Kung's enclosure of the Imperial decree sent to Lord Elgin on the 2d November was only a *copy*, and, considering Kung's character, there may readily be doubts as to the existence of an original, for the prince sends this copy on the 2d November. His letter is dated the 1st November, and states that the Imperial edict was received at 6 A.M. on that day ; *but three days before* the Imperial sanction had been obtained to the treaty, Prince Kung had taken upon himself to write to the Canton authorities, calling upon them to act upon certain articles. The expression in Lord Elgin's letter to Lord John Russell (Tien-tsin, 13th November) states that Prince Kung had sent him a despatch, "*embodying* an edict from the Emperor,"—the prince states that it was a *copy*. Antecedents render this very unsatisfactory, and it is a thousand pities that neither the Emperor nor the original document was seen.<sup>1</sup> Prince Kung visited Lord Elgin

<sup>1</sup> The Imperial Commissioners have even declared an original document to be a forgery. The paper was discovered at Hwayuen. See Elgin Mission Blue Book, pp. 462, 463.

on the very day on which he sent the copy of the edict, but he does not appear to have brought the original document with him ; the despatches make no mention of his doing so.

The treaty was posted up, but the British interpreters went round with the men to placard it. The despatches do not tell this, so far as they have been published, but I know, on good authority, that such was the case. The Emperor has fled to Tartary, and we have no real knowledge that he knows anything of the convention of Peking. The Tartars gained their point : the prince signed a paper, and the allied troops have left the capital. The convention gives us but little advantage over the treaty of Tien-tsin. Since that treaty was first signed the British war-expenses cannot be estimated at less than *ten millions sterling*, just the amount Sir James Elphinstone said the war would cost, at the time the House of Commons was induced to permit the war to go on, by the demand being granted *for eight hundred thousand pounds* ! The Emperor is supposed to state that, when the garrison at Takoo killed our men and sunk our ships, "it was a mistake of the garrison." If we make the Emperor's representative sign this, we know we make him sign a falsehood, for there are public documents to prove that Sang-ko-lin-sin fortified the place on purpose to keep our ships out. It was this apology that the war was to rest on, and, after all, *the apology*, if it be one, simply tells what is untrue.

The second article revokes a concession which Lord Elgin should never have made, and which in reality he did not make, but the Chinese Government was *led to understand* it might be made. The plain facts are these : In the treaty of Tien-tsin, which, as Lord Elgin says, "was extorted from their fears," the Emperor was supposed to agree to the permanent residence of a British plenipotentiary in Peking. The treaty was signed at seven o'clock in the evening of 26th June 1858, but Lord Elgin writes to Lord Malmesbury on the 5th November following :— "Your Lordship may perhaps remember that on the eve of the day on which the treaty of Tien-tsin was signed, I received a representation to the effect that the Chinese Commissioners

would certainly lose their heads if they conceded the articles in my treaty, providing for the residence of a British Minister at Peking, and empowering British subjects to travel through the country for trading purposes." This information has oozed out. It was suppressed in the publication of the first despatches sent with the treaty:<sup>1</sup> it certainly detracts from the value of it. However, Lord Elgin congratulates himself afterwards that the Commissioners did not lose their heads; and it seems very probable now that the Emperor did not sanction these clauses in the treaty, and, to save their heads, Mr. Bruce was not permitted to go to Peking to exchange the ratification of the treaty. As he was not permitted to go to Peking, the concession alluded to in the convention was never accorded, for it was on the stipulation of his *proper reception* that the concession was to be made. Therefore Article II. of the Convention was unnecessary, Article III. of the treaty of Tien-tsin relative to the plenipotentiary's residence being still in force.

The third article of the Convention has reference to the indemnity. I copy some remarks upon this which appeared in the *Daily Telegraph*; and as they clearly show of what little real benefit this indemnity will be to the English tax-payer, they will repay perusal:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—Touching the China war indemnity, the following statement may surprise the public:—

By the Convention of Peking the Tartar Government agrees to pay to the British 8,000,000 taels. Of this amount, 500,000 taels were expected to be paid on the 30th November at Tien-tsin, and 333,000 taels at Canton before the 1st January 1861, less expenses incurred at Sha-meen in fitting up the new factory site for Canton—expenses which are likely to amount to at least 133,000 taels; so that by the end of 1860 the cash received towards payment of the indemnity may be calculated at 700,000 taels, or a little over £200,000. We begin 1861 with a debt to us of 7,300,000 taels; but of this amount 2,000,000 taels are due to the British merchants at Canton, for their losses by the burning of the factories in 1856; so that only 5,300,000 taels remain to be recovered for the British Government at home. The 7,300,000

<sup>1</sup> It is not mentioned in those despatches (published in the Blue Book) sent at the time the treaty was forwarded. One of the despatches is marked "Extract."



taels are to be paid by quarterly instalments of one-fifth of the amount of duties collected at the ports open to foreign trade. Hang-ki, in his argument with Mr. Parkes, estimated the annual revenue by foreign duties at 4,000,000 taels, but this is rather under the mark. However, presuming he is right, as he is not very far wrong, the fifth would give us 800,000 taels a year ; so at this rate it would take about nine years before all the indemnity is paid !<sup>1</sup>

Now, if we have to keep a garrison in Tien-tsin, another at Canton, besides forces at Takow and Shanghai, in justice to the men we could not have less than 6000 as the total number of the British army kept in China, to secure the advantages of the treaty, and themselves from treachery. At a moderate estimate, each man would cost £30 a year—say 100 taels. This would make 600,000 taels as the expense of men alone. Officers' pay, naval force, and other contingencies, would soon make up the 800,000 taels we are to receive each year ; but, as a fourth of this is due to the British merchants at Canton, we shall actually be spending more money than we are to receive, and be keeping up a force to secure an indemnity at a greater expense than the amount of indemnity it is to secure. Besides all this, we have to pay, to bring the men home, a sum which will not be less than £50 each, or £300,000 (nearly 1,000,000 taels), in addition to which we lose the services of the men, whilst we shall have had to pay some ten or twelve millions of pounds sterling, of which we do not recover a farthing !

Take it in a Chinese point of view : they have to pay 8,000,000 taels, extending over a period of nearly ten years. The rate of interest in China is 1 per cent. per month ; but take it only at 10 per cent. per annum, the interest alone will clear off the foreign debt without the capital being touched at all. It must be remembered that 4,000,000 of taels have been due for more than two years and a half ; but there appears to have been no stipulation made for interest on this amount.

In reality, then, we get no indemnity by which the Chancellor of the Exchequer can reduce taxation in this country ; and if Lord Elgin has not settled the convention of Peking on favourable terms for the Tartars, so as to prevent that wretched, barbarous Government from falling, and allow it to continue to oppress the Chinese people, who are so willing to be friendly towards us, we must conclude that he was forced by circumstances to accept any treaty he could get the Tartar prince to agree to, or else he was, like the convention, *done* at Peking.

I could write a great deal more about the treaty, but hesitate to encroach on your space.—I am, Sir, yours, &c.,

CANTONIENSIS.

“So that, after all, we have to pay the indemnity ourselves—at least the

<sup>1</sup> By our participating in the new opium duties, this time will be reduced by a couple of years.



greater part of it, for it is notorious that the Government in China, no matter what stipulations may be made, have the power of increasing the inland transit dues to make up any loss they may suffer by non-payment of customs. To so great an extent is this increased taxation at present carried, that on many kinds of tea the duties are increased threefold beyond the regular amount charged some years ago. The most unsatisfactory part of the whole affair, however, is this—that after an expenditure of valuable lives, and some ten or twelve millions of money, we have only the *promise* of a paltry twenty per cent. of the pecuniary cost, and that promise is made by a power which is scarcely likely to last sufficiently long to pay a quarter of the amount it has been compelled to agree to. It is even doubtful whether it is entitled to receive the customs at the port which brings in the largest revenue. Already at Shanghai it has been arranged that only half duties shall be charged from last June ;<sup>1</sup> for then, to protect the city for the very Government with which we were at war, the allies landed troops to fight against the Taiping insurgents, and thereupon only half duties were to be charged by the Imperial Government. Further than this, these said insurgents hold the chief districts from which tea and silk are procured, and through which they have to pass, almost up to the very gates of Shanghai, and they already collect duties from the Chinese merchants ; so that if we are longer to hold Shanghai for the Tartars, we do so under the penalty that all the produce bought or sold by British merchants there has to pay double duty—one duty to the insurgents, another to the Tartars ; so that out of the latter payment the British Government may get part of the indemnity stipulated for in the treaty of Peking.”

Article iv. opens Tien-tsin to British trade. When the treaty of Tien-tsin was under discussion, this port was then named as one to be free to British ships, but the Imperial commissioners induced Mr. Bruce, who was then personally negotiating with them, to fix upon Newchwang instead. As we are to have a garrison for some time at Tientsin, and a resident Plenipotentiary at Peking, it is necessary that Tien-tsin should be a trading port ; and as we held the place when the convention was signed, the Prince Kung could not well resist this stipulation.

Article v. legalizes the emigration of Chinese. Under proper regulations, this may prove to be a valuable concession. At present there are certain Chinese employed by Spaniards and others to kidnap Chinese to take to Cuba. Some of these kidnappers were lately seized and executed at Amoy. The

<sup>1</sup> A Consular Notification was issued to that effect, 26th June 1860. Since the treaty has come into operation, full duties appear to be charged.

Chinese have been emigrating in large numbers to Australia, California, etc. There should have been a stipulation in the convention, that they should incur no penalty on their return ; this should be attended to in the future regulations that have to be framed.

Article vi. annuls the lease of Cowloon promontory, a small stripe opposite to Hong-Kong, formerly the resort of a great many vagabonds, and cedes it to the British Crown. Captain W. K. Hall, flag-captain to Sir M. Seymour, brought this position to the notice of H.M. Government some time ago. It is a curious circumstance that the Chinese Government should have let this land to the British. The first use made of it was to form a camp for the expedition which has since been at Peking. What the amount of rent was has not transpired, but this article of the convention will save that payment.

Article vii. provides for the treaty of Tien-tsin coming into operation about two years and a half after it was first signed. The tariff of this treaty is more favourable than that of Nankin. The Imperial Government has thus had the advantage of the higher rate of duties for a much longer time than it was entitled to, and all the Emperor gained is so much loss to the British merchant ; but there is no stipulation to cover this loss of an advantage to which by treaty the merchant was entitled.

Article viii. provides for the treaty being made public. I have remarked before how this was done at Peking.

Article ix. stipulates that the British evacuate Chusan, but permits British forces to hold Tien-tsin, Takoo, the north coast of Shan-tung, and the city of Canton, until the whole indemnity have been paid. It does not appear by this that we have a right to keep any garrison at Shanghai ; however, it appears we are still to do so to protect the city for the Imperialists. All the cash payment stipulated for has been paid. It amounts to the *large* sum of £170,000 paid at Tien-tsin, and a smaller amount paid at Canton. The whole of these two payments will scarcely cover the hire of transports for two months ! At one time we had about 140,000 tons of shipping hired for transports. The remainder of the indemnity is to be paid by the

deduction of one-fifth of the amount collected for foreign customs-duties at the different ports.

As the British pay by far the largest amounts of duties, would it not be more simple to cause the British merchants to pay one-fifth of their duties into the consulate, the consul furnishing a receipt to the merchant who could give that in with his other four-fifths of duties, instead of our being at the expense of keeping up a large force in China to guarantee the payment of an amount which it is in our own power to collect? This appears to be the most natural way, but it would not suit the French, who have but little trade, and who are to receive the same amount of war indemnity as the British, though they did not incur one quarter of the expense. The French have arranged to hold Canton for six years, unless, in order to get rid of them, the Imperial Government shall pay the amount at an earlier period.

Altogether, it looks very likely that we are to be at the expense of holding Canton and Tien-tsin, and protecting Shanghai, which pays by far the largest amount in duties into the Imperial treasury, in order that the Tartar government may be able to collect duties wherewith to pay the indemnity; and it is even said, that if the Yang-tsze Kiang be opened, full duties will be charged at the last Imperial port, even on merchandise going into or coming from the insurgent districts. The insurgents, of course, will exact their duty too, so that for the sake of this precious indemnity, which appears to cost more than it is worth to secure it, we are to help the Imperialists to get as large a revenue as possible from the foreign merchant, for the purpose of obtaining such a worthless indemnity. How have the mighty fallen! The telegraphic messages delighted our hearts with the prospect of eight millions of *taels*, few people knowing what a Chinaman's *tael* is: it might have been a pound, but in reality it is only that most unpleasantly legal of all amounts, a paltry six and eightpence, 6/8! Eight millions sounds large, but, after all, only six million taels go to the British Government, and nine-tenths of it have to be collected out of the amounts paid by the British merchants into the Imperial treasury. In reality, the force left in China may be required to keep the

Tartars in power until they have collected this indemnity fund from the foreign trade, and, so far as Shanghai, the largest paying place, is concerned, *this is already the fact*. It is more an indemnity to the Tartars than to the British !

These telegraphic messages from China have been very well managed, but the actual intelligence generally puts a damper upon them. I could bring forward many instances. When the indemnity was paid at Tien-tsin (the paltry £170,000), the amount was not stated : we were only to rejoice that this much-talked-of indemnity had been paid ! John Bull almost laughed at the Income Tax ! Then we heard that permission was given to steamers to run in the inland waters ! We had leading articles written about the vessels that would be required for the Yang-tsze Kiang, etc. When we got the mail news, we found that the permission had been given to a wretched little full-pressure boat called the "Bo-peep," to go to some places near Canton, places to which steamers went frequently when the mandarins were not in power, and the Triad rebels held sway ; and indeed, without mandarin leave, there were many trips made chiefly by Portuguese and American steamers until recently, when the *foreign inspectors* of Chinese customs began to look after these inland waters, and they it was who first stopped the traffic ! It is very amusing to any one acquainted with affairs in China, to see how the people in England are taught to congratulate themselves on *success*, for success is so dear to Englishmen ; indeed it is really a pity that it is necessary to show how little good this country has got from the ten millions spent on the last Chinese war. It is necessary to show this, because, if affairs go on much further in the same line, we shall be led into a war against the Chinese, the real trading population of China, to secure the *éclât* that has been strained out of the late treaties with the Tartars, our real enemies in China. Christianity and commerce have but few chances of success if we are to help the Tartars to maintain their iron rule over the industrious Chinese, and smother the first glimmering of Christian light that has for centuries flashed across the Chinese mind.



I may be wrong, though I have a firm conviction that I am right—I may be harsh, though my desire is to be lenient—I feel that I should not be doing my duty to my country or to the Chinese if I did not frankly state the opinions which I have formed, after an earnest study and long acquaintance with Chinese affairs; but the British public should know, that from Prince Kung's own statements he is not to be relied upon. The real value of the convention must be told. Suppose Prince Kung had known of the allied generals' intention, declared on the 15th October, that they had *determined* not to remain with the army at Peking later than the 1st November, is it likely that he would have signed the treaty only a week before the day the troops must leave? Further, suppose the Tartars had not agreed to the moderate terms dictated by Lord Elgin, when he knew the position he was in, would it not have been necessary, for the welfare of the empire, to treat with the other dominant power? Be it remembered, Lord Elgin had already pictured to Prince Kung the fall of the Tartar dynasty, and the prince had replied that a subject should not even mention such a thing. Lord Elgin wrote to Prince Kung on the 16th of October (the day after Sir Hope Grant had intimated his intention of leaving in a fortnight) trying to induce him to make peace, which was still doubtful. There was all the doubt, too, with regard to how the Tartars might take the burning of the palace; and if there was any intention on their part to make a prolonged resistance, we must think of communicating with the Chinese Emperor at Nankin, especially as the Tartar Emperor had fled. I ask, if the last arguments of Lord Elgin do not prove the anxiety that was shown to keep the Tartar dynasty from falling? The following are the *last* arguments employed by Lord Elgin, after threatening to seize the palace in Peking:—"He begs to remind the prince, that the customs' revenue of Canton is being collected for the profit of the supreme Government of China, although that city is in the military occupation of the allies. That it is the military force of the allies which has for some time past prevented Shanghai from falling into

the hands of the rebels, and that the junks carrying rice and tribute to Peking have been allowed to pass and repass unmolested, although the fleets of the allies command both the seas and the rivers."

Lord Elgin, in fact, told our enemies how much we had done for them, and even said that we had prevented an important city from falling into the hands of their other enemies, men who were willing to be our friends. *The opposition we had shown to the rebels was held out as an argument why the Tartars should make peace with us.* Probably the prince thought that we might be again made useful in the same way. But it is difficult to tell what Prince Kung thinks or knows, for when Mr. Bruce told him, six weeks afterwards, of what had been done against the insurgents at Shanghai, he pretended not to have known anything about it!

Now, what have the Tartars done to merit all the consideration shown? Can anybody tell? The troops have left Peking, so have Lord Elgin, Mr. Bruce, and all the other high officials. Young Adkins was left behind, and now, excepting him, all that is British at that miserable city are the mangled remains of the unfortunate victims who had been so cruelly tortured by our Tartar *friends*! The convention of Peking and Treaty of Tien-tsin are concluded. They may eventually be of some value, but they will be dearly bought if they are to lead us in any way to support such a government as the Tartar government of China, even should we have no reason to favour any other.

We have heard a great deal of the decline of China under Tartar rule. The state of Tien-tsin and Peking serves to prove it. The only real sign of wealth and luxury was in the Emperor's palace. He revels on the fat of the land, while his people are allowed to suffer all the miseries of civil war; and the army, which should be kept to protect the State and the people, is permitted to plunder for its pay, and in fact has an existence chiefly on paper, the mandarins pocketing the pay of a nominal army; and instead of the garrison of Peking numbering 150,000 men (which statistics show it should have been),



scarcely 30,000 were ever brought into the field, and the capital itself was entered by the allies without a shot being fired from its walls in its defence !

Though the Emperor will never feel the payment of the indemnity which Prince Kung promises to pay, the Tartar power will be greatly interfered with by the other promises of that prince. To Russia he has granted a large portion of Manchooria, signing away territory equal in extent to Corea, giving up part of the hereditary lands of the Tartars, and providing an open winter harbour in the Eastern seas for the Russians. No Government is better informed about China than that of Russia. It well knows what the fate of the Tartar empire of China must soon be, and it is making its preparations accordingly. Russian plenipotentiaries are always in China at the right moment. Count Poutiatin, the former ambassador, appeared to be almost ubiquitous. In his little steamer he moved about the coast of China, generally managing to pop in before Lord Elgin, whenever his presence would be of service to his Government. He was a quiet, unassuming, clever man, who kept his eyes open to all that was going on ; and some of his officers were most superior men, evidently picked out for the service in which they were engaged. He organized plans, which are now being carried out, for the establishment of an important station near the mouth of the " Amoor," and a very considerable fleet has gradually been collected there. Every vessel that came out from Europe to join the fleet had, I was informed, the armament and machinery for another steamer on board ; and there is an unlimited supply of timber procurable near the new station upon the Amoor. Gold is also to be had there, and at present there is a commission formed to report on the best districts ; so that when free liberty is given to persons to search for and work the gold, a population will soon be obtained for the newly acquired territory. In April next the districts were to be opened, according to a report current some short time ago. With our new trade opening up at Japan, it will not be long before a British trade is opened up with the Amoor. We have also our new gold territory at Columbia and Van-

couver's Island, within an easy voyage of Eastern Russia, so that ere long we may see a most important Russian province grow out of the last Tartar concessions; and the more important it becomes, the more likely it is to extend further into Mantchooria. The Russians will be quite prepared for this whenever the Tartar power is overthrown in China. In fact, there is every prospect of Mantchooria and Corea falling into Russian power very soon, for, if the Tartars are driven from China, a Russian protectorate would likely be formed in the first instance, or advantage taken to secure the country while disturbances were going on. Already there are many Chinese settled in Mantchooria, and they might seek Russian assistance if the Tartars were driven in upon them from China.

Russia has been a bugbear to some people, and stories were told of Russian guns and Russian faces being seen at Takoo when the brave Admiral Hope was defeated. The admiral did not give credit in his despatches to such reports, but they were eagerly caught at by others, especially by naval officers, who did not like to believe that any Tartar force could defeat us. No Russian guns were found in the forts when last taken, nor is it likely that any Russians would be permitted, either by their own Government or that of China, to serve at Takoo. It would rather be the policy of the Czar to let the Tartars be driven from China; and, in the interests both of civilisation and commerce, it will be advantageous that the Russian power takes the place of the Tartar in the north of Asia. Christianity will be protected instead of checked, and commerce will grow up in a district where at present it scarcely exists.

We need not fear Russian power in the Pacific. Russia would have enough to do to protect itself; and the more extended its territories are, the more vulnerable do they become. We are always too apt to look for dangers and imagine what might be done to us in time of war. It would be better to look for the great advantages that might be gained in time of peace—the good that not only we might derive, but also that the people of the country might obtain; and the greater we

can make the advantages of peace, the less likelihood is there that we have to incur the dangers of war. The more civilized and commercial the north-west side of the Pacific becomes, the better will it be for our possessions on the north-east side of that ocean, as well as for all our commerce in the Indian and China seas. Russia can make strongholds there equal to Sebastopol, and, *if there was nothing but these fortresses*, we might have danger to fear; but the larger the territory they have to protect the less dangerous do they become. Our policy with Russia has been a bad one. If it can extend its territory, benefiting at the same time the new population which it rules over, we, who have taken India, North America, Australia, New Zealand, etc. etc., should have no objections. The larger our territory becomes, the more have we to protect in case of war. It is the same with Russia; and even if it takes all Mantchooria and Corea, it is not for us to throw the first stone.

The free trade on the frontiers of China, arranged for by the last Russian treaty, will be another severe blow to the Tartars; for the more unfettered trade becomes, the Chinese, who are the actual traders, gain importance. Russia has been making arrangements for increased trade in the centre of Asia. Last year there were seven steamers sent from Belgium, built under Russian contracts, and transported in pieces to Lake Baikal. A Belgian superintendent engineer was sent to put them up. So far as the new Russian treaty goes, there does not appear to be much accession of territory gained by the Russians in the west of China, but the ominous "etc." with reference to grants of land at Cashgar may be indefinitely extended. It brings the Russian traders down very near to our Indian possessions, and it might be advantageous if we established a consul there too; for, if the Tartar empire be overthrown, many of the western Chinese districts will probably become even more independent than they now actually are.

The concessions made by Prince Kung to the French, with reference to lands formerly occupied by Christians, can be made an endless source of annoyance to the Tartar Government.

Already the French claim the land in the Chinese city of Canton, on which Yeh's palace stood. This just divides the city in two parts; and the viceroy, it is said, has agreed to the claim; but some of the people in the neighbourhood, whose land is also to be taken, have protested. At Ningpo, the French consul, some years ago, made a claim for the site of one of the principal temples in the city, but at that time he could not procure it. At Shanghai, the land going west from the city for some miles formerly belonged to a rich Catholic family, one of whom was high in the state. In the province in which Shanghai is situated, the Roman Catholics claim to have 70,000 native converts; most of them, however, are of the poorer classes. Nearly all the province is now in the power of the Taiping insurgents; and the gentry are stated to be registering their adherence to the new dynasty, officers being employed at Soochow for that purpose. The plan adopted is to call upon the people to bring in their title-deeds to receive the stamp of the new dynasty, without which their lands would be liable to confiscation. This was said to be done in the province of Nganwhui, which the Taipings have now held for eight years, keeping possession of the principal cities. Some of these, however, have sometimes been besieged; and it was at the capital city of the province that Lord Elgin saw the people running in to the insurgents for protection from the Imperial troops, who were advancing on the city—the people carrying in all they could; the Imperialists burning and destroying the villages. The Tartar Government has no right to cede land to the French; and it will only make difficulties and differences between the French and the actual Chinese proprietors, if the land is appropriated without compensation being paid to the latter. There are already elements of discord between the French and the Chinese, and it will be to the advantage of the Tartars to encourage them; but it is very doubtful whether the French will see it in the same light, for they are scarcely prepared to commence a new war in China against the Chinese insurgents in support of the Tartars, who have so long been enemies to foreigners, and especially ill-disposed to the advance-



ment of Christianity. It is true that the interests of France in China are chiefly connected with the Propaganda and Catholic missions ; but though it may be disappointing to the Romish priests to see the Chinese insurgents profess a faith more closely allied with Protestants than Roman Catholics, and find them publishing the Bible as the standard of their faith, still it is too serious a matter to enter into a war with a people contending for their liberty and the expulsion of a foreign dynasty, to admit of the French Government taking up the cause of the Tartars against them. Our war has brought to light some curious facts, and exposed how thoroughly weak the Tartars are : in fact, it is acknowledged that the people, the Chinese of Peking, were so friendly disposed towards us, and had so little sympathy for their Tartar rulers, that it is believed they were prepared to rise against the latter if any resistance were made at Peking ; and it was this which brought the Tartars to terms with the allies.

But what is this Tartar power ? It is merely a party in the state trying to keep a conquered people in subjection by the severity of its punishments, and acting a gigantic sham. It is a delusion altogether. There was a show of resistance by the men hired by the government, or interested by nationality, to try to keep the Tartar Emperor on his throne when an attack was made in the neighbourhood of the capital, but the *people* showed no sympathy with the government ; their sympathy was rather with the allies. During our first arrival at Tien-tsin they hailed us as new rulers. They had to suffer but little of the terrors and carnage of war, though they did suffer somewhat from the plundering, which could not be prevented, and many resorted to suicide in their fright ; for that is often the most bloody part of war in China, as was too clearly seen at Chapoo and Chingkiang-foo when we attacked these places in 1842, and whole families destroyed themselves. There was nothing proved more clearly the care and trouble to prevent bloodshed at Canton when it was taken in 1857, than the prevention of suicide ; few instances were known. Sir Michael Seymour had diligently distributed proclamations telling clearly



our intentions, and the people had confidence in them. In fact they blamed Yeh most freely for the trouble he had brought upon them, and even accused him of doing it intentionally, as he wished that the Canton people might be punished for what the rebels from Canton had done. They had retaliated against him for scattering the ashes of the ancestors of some of their chiefs, by scattering to the winds the bones of some of Yeh's progenitors, whose graves were passed when the insurgents marched north. It was said, too, that all his family, with the exception of his father, were destroyed at the same time. The people were no more *for* Yeh at Canton than they were for the Emperor at Peking. There is a very interesting account of a march into the interior, described in the May number of the *Cornhill Magazine*, which fully supports me in what I say as regards the people at Canton; and my experience of four different provinces in China confirms me in the opinion that the present government is rather hated than merely despised. It only requires that the people shall be free from any fears of Tartar vengeance, and they then speak out openly their feelings. One of the best acquainted with the Chinese has stated, that "you will never find half a dozen Chinamen assembled together but they begin to abuse the government." This is carrying it perhaps too far, but here is a fact which proves how fearful the government is that the people should band together against it. The viceroys of the provinces have no power to execute a person until the Emperor has been communicated with and gives his consent, unless thirty people have been found in a clique gathered together for an illegal purpose. Thirty persons in the eyes of the Tartar government form a nucleus for insurrection, and then the subordinate officers have power of life and death over them. But instead of thirty in a province, they may now be counted by thousands in almost every province of the empire, and by tens of thousands in the most important provinces. Such are the changes going on, and such is the sign of the end of the Tartar power. Its last feeble effort is enlisting pirates on its side: it had done this at Amoy when that place was taken, and the officers of the British

ships of war were applied to to defend the mandarins from the very rascals whose assistance they had invoked. Ningpo has of late been frequently in a state of turmoil on account of the pirates in mandarin pay; and it was only the other day that the British consul at Shanghai was attacked by piratical boats hired by the government to fight against the Taipings! It appears probable that these same pirates have since killed Mr. Christison, and two foreigners with him.

There is a clause in the British treaty stating that the British officers, in conjunction with those of the Tartar government, shall consult together, and form plans for the suppression of piracy. If pirates are so employed by the Tartar government, we may soon find that we are fighting against our new *friends*. It is but recently that some pirates, captured by a British cruiser, on being handed over to the authorities at Foo-chow, were at once released, the mandarins saying that they were "reformed thieves." They had been engaged in government employ! How are we to act in concert with such a government? What power can that government have for good, when there is scarcely the shadow of an attempt made by it to suppress piracy, and it even enlists pirates into its service? Since our first war in China, two of the principal pirate chiefs have been made high officers under the Tartar government, and placed in command of considerable forces. These men were real pirates; but there have been many classed as pirates who in reality were rebels, and who were destroyed by British cruisers acting as allies for the Imperial government. There will be no real neutrality in the civil war if British officers are to be directed by the mandarins, and act in conjunction with them against whatever they choose to call pirates.

The Tartar government has comparatively no power among the Chinese, without relying on the people being in fear of its vengeance; for the Tartar garrisons stationed throughout the empire have dwindled away, and consist of a slipshod, idle, lazy set, who know that the people have no sympathy with them. These Tartars do not intermarry with the Chinese, they

do not trade, and are good for very little at fighting. At Nankin and Chingkiang-foo they scarcely made any resistance to the Taipings, and it was reported that all were killed. This is an exaggeration, however, for there was a notice in the *Pekin Gazette* appointing a certain sum to be appropriated for the use of those Tartars who escaped from Nankin. The Tartar garrison at Canton has no occupation: the allies hold that city. Nankin is held by Taiping-Wang. Soochow, Nganking, and Ching-too, other principal Tartar garrisons, are also in the hands of the Taipings, six others have been besieged by these insurgents, and three taken, but since given up. Ching Kiang-foo and Chapoo, two other Tartar stations, are in imminent danger. Indeed it is doubtful if any Tartars remain in these places, the probability being, that their garrisons have been withdrawn to aid in the defence of other places. A great deal has been said of the power of the Tartar army under Sang-ko-lin-sin; but after his men were driven from the cover of the forts at Takoo, they never made any stand; and we have the fact, that after the march on Peking began, until the An-ting gate was in our possession, our loss in killed was not equal to the number of victims who suffered by the treachery and torturing of their Tartar captors. This is a very clear proof against any heroism on the part of the much-vaunted Tartar army; and the single condition, that none of the Chinese attached to our army should enter Peking, as stipulated for by the Tartar authorities, before the An-ting gate was opened for our troops, proves that the Tartars were in as great fear of their Chinese as of their foreign foes!<sup>1</sup> Yet these Tartars considered themselves a military nation. When they conquered China, or rather amalgamated their armies with those of Chinese generals who were trying to put down an insurrection, and then seized the country for themselves (for that is the real truth of the Tartar conquest 220 years ago), they were a military people; but any foreigner who has watched their manœuvres and exercises will wonder how they ever managed to conquer "the hills and the streams."

<sup>1</sup> I am not able to find this condition mentioned in the despatches, but it was stated in the telegram. Probably it was merely a verbal agreement.

## CHAPTER V.

### OUR POLICY.

It would be ungracious to point out so many errors in the late policy of the British Government in China if I were not prepared to suggest a line of policy which would be less dangerous and more advantageous. It is only in hopes of doing good that I venture to presume to make the suggestions.

Let our authorities have as little to do with the Imperial authorities as possible until an interview has been granted by the Emperor to our ambassador. Past experience has proved that the Imperial authorities are not to be depended on.

Cultivate as much as possible the good feeling of the Chinese people, the real trading classes, and do not rely so much on the information furnished by the mandarins.

Above all things, do not attempt to coax and conciliate the Imperial officers. They are arrogant enough already, and it is their arrogance which has caused all the difficulties of the last four years. Whenever we attempt to win over the mandarins they become more impracticable, unless they wish to secure an advantage for themselves. We have been too often their enemies for them to become sincere friends.

The home Government should define what neutrality is.

Let us be strictly neutral between the Tartars and the insurgents so far as armed assistance is concerned; but, being neutral, there is no reason why our officials should not receive communications from either party, and, by friendly counsel, try to prevent disorder and bloodshed, and thus try to do some good.

Let us acknowledge the *de facto* power in the territory which it holds, taking our present treaty and tariff as a guide with both parties. It is quite ridiculous to say that a power which has held a place for eight years is not *de facto* the ruling one, especially when it holds great part of the adjacent pro-



vinces. In the event of new difficulties arising with the Imperial Government, the "favoured nation clause" should at once be put in force, and, acting upon the last Russian treaty, which makes free trade at all the frontiers, let us have the same at all the ports. I believe that the Russians at the *ports* would conform to our tariff, so that under the existing treaty it may be questioned if we have a right to claim the privileges of the "favoured nation clause;" but should new difficulties arise, this ought to be acted on: at any rate, the Foreign Customs Establishment should, in such a case, be abolished.<sup>1</sup> It is anomalous that during war we should collect the duties for our enemies, and, even during a civil war, in which we are supposed to be neutral, it is very questionable policy so to act. I feel convinced that one of the main reasons for this establishment being carried on and extended by Lord Elgin was to secure the indemnity he had to demand. Our principles of honesty were made to stand bail as guarantee for the Emperor's debts. This was very diplomatic, but it looks ill. Our honesty becomes questionable.

The most *stringent* orders should be given about passports for the interior. We must not run away with the idea that China is to be free to all foreigners, and the rivers to all vessels. If it were only known in this country what questionable characters, and what disreputable vessels we have in the East, my reasons would be thoroughly understood. There is a class of vessels sailing out of Hongkong that are little better than pirates, yet they carry the British flag; there are as many more under other flags. These vessels must not have the *run* of China; in fact, they should be discouraged as much as possible, and some other plan adopted to scrape together a revenue for Hong-kong, than by granting licenses to such craft. It is but a paltry sum the colony gains from them.

Once give these vessels the right of going up the rivers, there will be no end to difficulties, and our good name is certain to be tarnished. The right to take our ships into the

<sup>1</sup> I have no objection to this establishment during perfect peace; on the contrary, I consider that it has many advantages to the honest merchant.



inland waters is a great privilege—one that we do not enjoy in any other foreign country ; but it is a right which may be greatly abused, and I warn the Government of the danger. It is not for me to point out how it should be averted, for all foreign nations trading with China should combine. I shall again enter on this most important subject, when treating of opium ; but I cannot now leave it without alluding to Captain Osborn's very unfair criticism in *Blackwood's Magazine*, of April 1860, when he reviewed my little work, *Twelve Years in China*. "He," says Captain Osborn, writing of me, "is a perfect Chinaman, and his creed is comprised in two sentences, which we give *verbatim* :— ' I would,' says the Resident, 'condemn the unrestricted navigation of the rivers, and think that good might be done if the navigation on the coast was restricted also' !!! These are the authorities whom we are to receive as oracles—these are the people who are hampering the action of the Foreign Office, and alarming the Chancellor of the Exchequer." I have no doubt that Captain Osborn had good reasons to try to pooh-pooh my opinions, but you may judge of the value of his criticism *when he omits* the words which follow those he quoted—"for there is a class of adventurers, who scarcely deserve any protection, who own and sail lorchas, employing them often in the most illegal acts along the whole seaboard of China, under whatever flag may be most convenient ; and if these craft had the right to go at will up the rivers of China, great harm might be done." I am glad to say that when Captain Osborn reprinted the article in his work, *British Relations in China*, he did me the justice to omit the whole of the criticism. That, perhaps, is a stronger answer to it than anything I can say. Perhaps even a stronger answer is, that one of these very lorchas (the "Arrow") was the root of all the evil of the last war, and Captain Osborn knew this when he omitted the principal part of his *verbatim* quotation !

As our chief relations with China are commercial, we must take care that commerce is as little disturbed as possible. The honesty and standing of the class of men who first go into the interior of a country like China is a most important point,

and we should not rashly attempt to open up the country too suddenly. We should legislate and make enactments for the benefit of future years, and not endanger advantages to be derived then, by too great precipitancy now.

I have frequently mentioned the words "good counsel;" they include a great deal. I would class government officers and missionaries as those whose special position most fit them to give it. I can see no reason why good counsel need be withheld from any one. It is difficult to tell how it should be tendered, or what occasions might arise. What I have to state is this, that I have little doubt of its *being properly received*; except, perhaps, where a settled policy decidedly prevents its being taken.

Many instances have been published of the insurgents, on the Yang-tsze Kiang readily acting upon foreign advice, when they were warned of the danger of fighting with us, even if they ever had such intention. Many well-authenticated stories are told of property and persons given up by the Triads upon the mere requisition of a foreigner. Many lives were saved in this way. In the archives of the British Consulate at Shanghai will be found documents which I induced the Triad chiefs to sign, surrendering themselves and the city to the Three Treaty powers. I induced them to do it to save the lives of hundreds of poor people in Shanghai, who were in great danger in case the Imperialists got into the city. The French Admiral, I believe, wished that the city should be surrendered to the French alone, so the surrender arrangement fell through. The French and Imperialists did attack the city, and the latter thus distinguished themselves—(I prefer to give Dr. Lockhart's account to any of my own):—"After rushing into the city, they not only decapitated those who had been killed in the engagement with the French, but attacked the unfortunate inhabitants, cutting off their heads, and in some cases their ears, as trophies of valour! A soldier, brought to the hospital with a gun-shot wound in his head, had his wallet *filled with ears*, and a portion of a scalp with the bone attached, which had been chopped from a man's head!"<sup>1</sup> I knew what would occur

<sup>1</sup> *Medical Missionary in China*, p. 319.

if the soldiers got their own way. This time they were driven out. However, I set to work to try to get the chiefs to let out the poor people before the soldiers got in again; and though there was some danger and difficulty in communicating with the city, which was closely blockaded, I thank God that I was successful, and the chiefs permitted nearly all the women and children to come out; so that, when the city was eventually taken, there were very few people in it. Further than this, I eventually persuaded the chiefs to surrender to the French Admiral; and I went with Mr. Wade to arrange this with the Admiral, but, owing to his objecting to my going into the city to inform the chiefs that he accepted the surrender, the insurgents, who waited two days, could wait no longer, and went off. A number did surrender to the French Admiral. "It was shortly known, however, that nearly all these were at once put to death by the Chinese, greatly to the indignation of the Admiral."<sup>1</sup> As the Triads saved the people for me, I did what I could to save the Triads, though many of those at Shanghai little deserved it. However, these statements show that the Chinese will act upon a foreigner's counsel, and that good can be done by mere counsel. Why, then, has it been so much withheld? Lord Elgin's advisers, Messrs. Wade and Lay, translated the documents I brought from the city, and Mr. Wade, as I have said, went with me to the Admiral. They cannot, therefore, be ignorant of what can be done, and my readers will see that I have good reason for what I write.

Young Lord Sefton, in his speech on the address at the opening of Parliament, offers good counsel to British subjects in China, which it is to be hoped they will take. "He trusted that he might not be considered impertinent if he ventured to express a hope that the English community in those distant lands had also learned a lesson as to the necessity of prudence in their dealings with the natives of these countries." This would be all very right, but when it follows a sentence stating that his Lordship "hoped that the Emperor's crafty and bigoted advisers who led him into the scrape had now learnt a lesson

<sup>1</sup> *Medical Missionary in China*, p. 324.

which would be impressed upon their minds for some time to come," it would appear that his Lordship attached some blame to the English community for the war which is just ended. This would be most unjust, as they never were in the slightest degree implicated with it. It was entirely a Government affair from beginning to end. But as there have been attempts in various quarters to shake off any of the blame of China wars from the Government on to the shoulders of the merchants, and to place the British merchants in China in a wrong light, I will quote what the merchants themselves say in an address which we presented to Lord Elgin on his first arrival in Hong-Kong:—"It must be apparent to your Lordship that our best interests lie upon the side of peace, and upon the earliest solid peace that can be obtained; but, notwithstanding this, we would most earnestly deprecate any settlement of the question which should not have eliminated from it the very last element of future disorder." And they preface this statement by saying, "Many of us have already been heavy sufferers by the present difficulty." The war has extended, with some intervals of peace, for four years!

The merchants in China have such large interests engaged in trade that they look upon any peace patched up for the sake of expediency as one that will in the end be anything but satisfactory. And the interests of a trade which brings in a revenue of about £8,000,000 to £9,000,000 to the British Government in England and in India, and employs a capital representing close upon £30,000,000, cannot but be intimately connected with the general prosperity of Great Britain. These things are not thought of in this country, and, indeed, it is only when the people here can read exciting stories of battles or horrors in China that the majority care anything about it. The fighting over, even the gallant little army is forgotten after the vote of thanks is passed for their services!

It is not generally known in this country that Taiping Wang, in his publications which have been translated, urges the Chinese to give up idolatry and worship the true God, because *in former ages the Chinese did so*, and he points to that period



as the brightest era in their history. Confucius also mentions it as the time when China was most famous for men celebrated for their wisdom and integrity. In later years, Tai-tsung, who ruled over China, when that empire extended to the confines of Europe, in 639, ordered a Christian church to be built in the capital, and had the Scriptures translated in the library of the palace. He stated that Christianity is a religion which must have been "*instituted as that which is essential to mankind.*" He was the greatest Emperor China ever had.

In the year 781 A.D., the celebrated monument with regard to Christianity was erected at Singan-foo, a city in the province of Shen-see, but it does not appear to have been discovered by Europeans till just before the Tartar conquest. It proves that in those early days Christianity had attained a prominent position in China, and that the Chinese Emperors then favoured it. Here is an extract from Dr. Bridgman's translation of the above monument:—"The true Lord is without beginning, silent, serene, and unchangeable. Possessed of creative power, he raised the earth and set up the heavens. The divided Person came into the world. The bark of Salvation was boundless. . . The bright and illustrious religion visited our Tang dynasty, *which translated the Scriptures and built churches.* The ship of mercy was prepared for the living and the dead. All blessings sprang into existence; and all nations were at peace. Kau-tsung continued the work of his ancestors, and repaired the temples. The palace of concord was greatly enlarged. *Churches filled the land,* and the true doctrine was clearly preached."

Marco Polo, who governed a Chinese province, makes frequent mention of the Nestorian Christians in China. It is very difficult to tell how long Christianity existed, but when the Spanish Embassy visited the great Tamarlane at Samarcand in the beginning of the fifteenth century, Don Clavijo mentions the arrival of ambassadors from China, and states that "they were Christians, *after the manner of those of Cathay.*"<sup>1</sup> What that manner was it would now be interesting to know. Roman Catholic missionaries had been in China

<sup>1</sup> *Embassy to the Court of Timour*, p. 141. Published by the Hakluyt Society, 1860.



previous to that date (in 1247), and were opposed by the Nestorians, thus proving that Christianity still existed in China; and from a letter still extant, written by one of the Catholic missionaries about the beginning of the fourteenth century, it would appear that the Roman Catholics directed their efforts at evangelisation among the Mongols, who were shortly afterwards expelled by the Chinese from China. The Nestorians being opposed to the Roman Catholics, probably were more successful among the Chinese. Some of the Chinese tribes who had never submitted to the Tartar rule, and who joined Taiping Wang, must have had some remnants of the Christian faith among them, for one of them at Chin-kiang declared that his tribe had "never worshipped idols;" and thus they willingly joined Taiping Wang. Mr. Meadows was told by one of them "that 3000 of his people were with the Taipings," "and spoke with pride of the fact that they had never submitted to the rule of the Mantchoos."

It was not till the end of the sixteenth century that the Roman Catholics firmly established missions in China. Some attempts had previously been made, but "the Spanish and Portuguese merchants were opposed to the extension of a faith which their flagitious conduct so outrageously belied."<sup>1</sup> With such conduct on the part of the merchants, no wonder that the Chinese government then opposed the foreign missionaries. But those who reached Peking at the end of the sixteenth century were favourably received by the Chinese Emperor, but as they gained power the mandarins became jealous and got them removed from Peking in 1617, but the edict ordering this was very soon revoked, and in 1628 a German missionary was ranked by the Emperor among the most distinguished men in the empire. Then the Tartar conquest began. The Catholic missionaries at Peking took the strongest side, and were for some time in favour at the Court of the Tartar Emperor, *who employed them to teach the art of casting cannon*. This they did, though the other missionaries in the South supported the Chinese,

<sup>1</sup> Williams' *Middle Kingdom*. Also Mendoza's *History of China*. Hakluyt Society, 1853. Introduction by R. H. Major, p. xxxvi., where further authorities are given.

whose army was led by two native Christians, and the family of the *Chinese* claimant to the throne were also Christians ! The Tartars, however, were successful in the struggle. On the death of their first Emperor the missionaries at Peking were persecuted for teaching the people "a false and pernicious doctrine." The above-mentioned German missionary was proscribed and degraded, and died of grief ; others were flogged and imprisoned, covered with chains. In 1671 the next Tartar Emperor released the missionaries, and again made them useful in casting cannon, which *they blessed*. They were not permitted openly to make converts, nevertheless they succeeded in making many ; but before the end of this reign persecutions began, and, when the third Emperor came to the throne, Christianity was specially interdicted, and the only success the Catholics had for many years, they confess, was owing to the efforts of native converts. The priests were persecuted, and from the middle of the last century many were executed or tortured to death. It was the official murder of a Catholic priest, a few years ago, which formed the reason for our having the French as our allies in the late war.

I have told all this to show, that *even if there had been no Chinese insurrection* with a leader attempting to propagate Christianity, the policy of the British government should certainly not have been to favour the Tartars ; and I plead now that the British power may not be used against the Chinese chief who has published in his book of Declarations such a sentence as the one I extract :—"Now in Heaven above, in earth beneath, and among men, there is none greater than Jesus."<sup>1</sup>

In the *North China Herald* of the 22d December last, there is the narrative of two missionaries who were kindly received by immense numbers of the Taipings ; but at one city in Imperial possession, they offered Bibles and tracts to the Imperial officers, who refused them when they found such names as "Jehovah" and "Jesus," they said these were *rebel terms* !! Need I write any more to sustain my arguments ?

<sup>1</sup> I believe that Sir George Bonham sent a translation of this work to the Government, with other documents received at Nanking, so long ago as 1853.

## CHAPTER VI.

### OPIUM.

THOUGH opium is not mentioned in the treaty of Tien-tsin, its importation into China is legalized by the tariff afterwards arranged by Lord Elgin at Shanghai. "Opium will henceforth pay thirty taels per pecul" (about £8, 8s. per cwt.) "import-duty. The importer will sell it only at the port. It will be carried into the interior by Chinese only, and only as Chinese property. The foreign trader will not be allowed to accompany it. . . . *The transit-dues on it will be arranged as the Chinese Government see fit.*" Before the treaty of Tien-tsin the mandarins had legalized opium at several of the ports, and charged a fixed duty on it in some cases less than the above fixed rate. What the inland transit-duties have been it is difficult to say, for where the drug is not smuggled they vary very considerably. At any rate, now the mandarins are authorized to charge *whatever they choose*.

If there is no harm in the opium trade, and its importation is legalized, why should it not have the same benefit as other goods with regard to transit-duties? It is either a good trade or a bad trade. If it is the latter, why legalize its importation, or rather, why insist upon the Chinese doing so?

I think that the regulation in the treaty casts a doubt upon the beneficial nature of the trade. Yet Her Majesty's Government in India are the largest dealers in it!—actual dealers!—and besides this, by an export-duty on Malwa opium shipped from Bombay, the revenue, with the sales and duty derived from opium, is about £4,000,000 per annum to the benefit of Her Majesty's Government.

The balance of trade is already against us in China, and were it not for the immense value of the opium trade, England *might* have to export more silver to China than she does. These are important matters, and deserve a great deal of consideration.

Opium, taken in excess, is most pernicious to the human frame. I would class it as bad as gin drinking. Taken in moderation, it may be classed as equal to wine and beer drinking. Some say it is worse: some say wine and beer are bad for us. Missionaries, who hear of the worst cases of opium smoking, and see them in their hospitals, can bear strong witness against its use. I have seen several bad cases, but the generality of Chinamen who smoke opium do not appear to be much the worse for it. The whole thing is a matter of opinion. I don't see why Chinese should be excommunicated<sup>1</sup> for smoking opium when the foreign importer is not interfered with. He is probably the chief supporter of the Church the Chinaman is excommunicated from, or the chief contributor to the hospital where the Chinaman is cured of his smoking propensity. The chief danger of opium importation, in my opinion, is the terrible inducement it *has been* to smugglers. Latterly the mandarins themselves have been the chief smugglers; but as in all cases the great value of the cargo was a strong temptation to pirates, these opium-smuggling boats were *heavily armed*, and often, when they had nothing else to do, no doubt were pirates too. This is bad: it has been *very* bad on the coast. Now, I ask, what will it be if the authorities put on heavy inland taxes, and the Chinese and foreigners try to smuggle the drug into the interior? Piracy at sea is bad enough, but it is worse when carried on inland. The prohibition to foreigners going with the drug will be evaded; the Chinese can hire plenty of rascals who will do it. Some foreigners will do it for their own gain, and opium may again make another war in China! Will the lorchas I have alluded to not try to smuggle? We may have another lorcha war!

The insurgents profess to prohibit opium, but no doubt many of their followers use the drug. The British authorities should

<sup>1</sup> This has actually been done.

either have prohibited the opium trade altogether, or made no difference between it and any other article.

The consumption in China is steadily increasing ; therefore, if it does harm, the evil is on the increase too. In 1800 the Chinese prohibited its importation "because it took so much silver out of the country." Then the import was about 2500 chests, but, notwithstanding the prohibition, it increased, and, before it was legalized, nearly 80,000 chests (about £14,000,000 worth) were imported into China in one year !

The Government has become so impoverished that its officers partly legalize the trade : it is then forced by treaty to legalize it at all ports. For an import-duty of £800,000 that the Government obtains, the people of China pay £14,000,000, which all goes away *in smoke*. If we take the retail price and inland taxation, probably £18,000,000 a year is now paid by those Chinese who smoke the drug ! All money gone into nothing, certainly for no actual benefit ! No wonder than the country is impoverished, and that we are not able to drive a very flourishing trade in other imports of really useful articles ! I believe that the troubles in the country—the inability of the Government to foster and protect trade in any way—have created much idleness, and, for a solace, no doubt, many Chinese took to the opium pipe.<sup>1</sup> We get tea and silk from their respective districts in large quantities, in spite of the disturbances, and these districts derive some benefit from the opium trade, for they get most of the silver paid for the drug ; but we do not sell as many manufactured goods as we ought to be able to do. The import value of manufactured goods is scarcely equal to one-fifth of the value of opium, and it becomes a question for political economists whether or not the opium trade is *really* advantageous to us. There can be no doubt whatever that it is very disadvantageous to the greater part of China. It is killing the goose that lays our golden eggs !

<sup>1</sup> The Chinese, male and female, smoke tobacco. Suppose 100,000,000 people smoke only two shillings worth each per annum, here is another £10,000,000 gone in smoke ; but this is not lost to the country, as the tobacco is grown in China. The above estimates for opium value are rather under Shanghai rates in December last. Tobacco is probably consumed to double or treble the amount I give.



There have been a great many changes in commercial affairs in China of late years. Among others the assortment of woollens has changed in colours. The best demand has often been for the gay hues worn in the rebel districts; it was this which confirmed my belief in the power of the insurgents when we were told that they were nearly defeated. Rice has been imported very largely, and a coast trade has been done in it. This is an innovation within the last six years. The opium trade has changed hands in a great measure, and I believe that the largest quantity is now imported on account of Indian Parsees, Jews, and Armenian houses, all British subjects.

[Were it not for opium we would have to send a very large amount of silver to China, unless we got the Chinese to take our manufactured goods—in fact, we would have to pay money for our silk, instead of the Chinese paying money for our opium.] It stands to reason that some day there must be a change made in the opium trade, unless we can take more tea and silk to balance the payment of it as it increases. It entirely rests with Her Majesty's Government to settle this matter, for it is quite in their power; they are the most largely interested.

Suppose that a Chinese labourer pays half his wages for opium. He buys as much with it as he can. Suppose the price were doubled, he could only smoke half as much; for the rest of his wages are necessary to keep him in food.

If Her Majesty's Government in India would *suddenly* tax opium in Bombay an extra 500 rupees per chest, and raise the price of Patna and Benares (of which Her Majesty has the monopoly) to an equal ratio, then the price of opium in China would be so much augmented that, in all probability, only half the quantity would be consumed. So far as revenue is concerned, Her Majesty would not be a loser. So far as monetary affairs in China were concerned, we would at first just get as much money; but the Chinese would be only consuming half the amount of opium. Go on increasing the duty and charge in India, at uncertain periods, until the export was greatly re-

duced, and in due time only the wealthy Chinese could consume it. Those who are not desperately addicted to the use of opium can give it up without much inconvenience, and by proper treatment any one could, in time and by degrees, forego the stimulant.

We know this by prison experience in Hong-Kong. Some men when first admitted really require it, but many do not get it, and, by force of circumstances, must get over their disappointment. In one of my first visits to the gaol in Hong-Kong, as visiting justice of the peace, I was astonished to find that the Chinese prisoners did not get *tea* ; but had to drink cold water, which Chinese rarely do. To a Chinaman this must have been as bad a punishment as being deprived of opium. It seemed to me to be *cruel*. We called up some of the Chinese prisoners, and asked them if they got enough to eat, and if they would rather forego a small quantity of their rice rations, and in lieu have some tea. They were delighted, and have ever since had tea : it being so cheap, it did not add one farthing to the cost of prison-food ; and, I believe, the gaol has been much more healthy since. If tea could be dispensed with at all, a Chinaman could try to live without opium.

If the India Board in London will only take the initiative, they will do immense good by checking the consumption of opium in China. I show that it will do the revenue no harm : it will improve rather than injure general trade ; and the plan I propose would not in the end do any harm to any one if it is properly managed. Sir John Lawrence, or other famous Indian officials, would be able to give good advice how to manage it.<sup>1</sup>

Opium is grown in China, but I question if it will be, should Taiping or any of his kings eventually gain the empire ; and I firmly believe that nine-tenths of the Chinese would rejoice if the consumption were checked. A small quantity of Turkey

<sup>1</sup> Before the province of Malwa came under British dominion, the plan adopted by the East India Company was to get the largest possible revenue from the smallest possible quantity of opium. Since then the production has been encouraged in order to increase the revenue.

opium is sent to China, but it is not liked ; it causes headache.

I have now commented upon many subjects very freely ; for my heart is in the work ; and as I send a copy of this pamphlet to nearly every leading member of the legislature, it is their fault, and not mine, if our policy, in relation to an empire which numbers almost one-third of the human race, does not get that attention which its importance deserves.

This is a *national* question, and all parties should join now to try to do some good in a country where, directly and indirectly, we have done much harm. We have introduced a trade which has impoverished the country, and made many an honest man dissipated : we have introduced God's Holy Word, and *by our neglect* it may prove to be a curse to the Chinese, instead of a blessing, for ages to come.

## CHAPTER VII.

### IMPERIALISTS IN CHINA AND THEIR SUPPORTERS IN ENGLAND.

At the moment when the prospects of the prisoners at Peking appeared to be darker than ever, one of the Imperial officers informed Mr. Parkes that arrangements had been made to set them free. But even then, Mr. Parkes says, we were "unable to rely upon the assurance of any mandarin!" Such has always been the case. We can never trust them; and yet information derived from that source has led Lord Elgin and others to put faith in all the stories told by them against the insurgents, even though the only proof which Lord Elgin had of the actual feeling of the people with regard to the insurgents—the only actual proof of the active sympathy of the Chinese with one side or the other—was seeing the people run to the insurgents for protection. Though there was positive evidence of the Imperialists committing the destruction so frequently attributed to the insurgents, yet all the blame was cast upon the latter. There has always been a doubt as to the truth of Imperialist reports, so many of them have been proved to be false; but we have positive proof that the destruction of many places (take for instance the suburbs of Soochow and Hangchow) was the work of the Imperialists. We have seen it in the Canton province; we have seen it at Amoy; we have seen it when the Imperial troops first entered Shanghai with the French, in 1856: they set fire to the houses as soon as they entered the place. Their *rule* is to destroy the places they re-capture from the rebels, thus hoping to force the people to side against the rebels, and keep them from ever getting possession. In the narrative of Lord Elgin's expedition up the Yang-tsze-kiang it will be found that the suburbs of those places held by the insurgents had generally been destroyed (probably as at Soochow and Hangchow, by the Imperialists, to protect the cities when first attacked), but in all those cities taken from the insurgents,

and occupied by the Imperialists, the interior was, in nearly every case, merely a howling waste; and though the towns held by the insurgents had been deserted by the greater part of their inhabitants, Mr. Oliphant describes several cities, held by the Imperial troops, which had almost no other inhabitants than the garrison. We have only hearsay evidence, from Imperial sources, or from people within the Imperial power, of any destruction of places by the insurgents; and I feel convinced, that when the real facts are properly ascertained, we will find that by far the greatest destruction and cruelty during the civil war has been the act of the Government soldiers.<sup>1</sup> The nearer we get to the insurgents the more certain is the proof of this. I do not mean to say that the insurgents do not commit any acts of destruction, and never plunder. Civil war cannot be carried on without great misery to the people; but I will bring proofs to show that they are not so bad as they have been painted, and will even give their own statements in proof of some of the destruction being committed by them. Our generals are not responsible for every act of brigandage of our soldiers, and it would be extraordinary if the forces of the insurgents were never to blame, especially when they are known often to have been reinforced by deserters from the Imperialists. The chiefs of the revolution have an enterprise to carry out and a new faith to promulgate, but it is necessary that they form an army, or several armies, to fight against those opposed to them. When Richard Cœur-de-Lion, and the other leaders of the Crusades, went to conquer Palestine, are we to believe that their soldiers and vassals were all imbued with the noble spirit and religious sympathies of their chiefs? We know that the chief interest which France has in a war with China is its sympathy with the Catholic religion. Are we to suppose that every man in the French army, ay, or every officer, heartily joins in his duty from religious motives, and would never think of plunder? Then why should we expect semi-civilized Chinese troops, enlisted by the leaders of the rebellion, to have precisely the same spirit as those who induced them to join the venture? We know that many join from hatred to the Tartars. One man at Nankin said that his family had been so cruelly treated by the Tartars, when they conquered the country, that there never had been any important revolt since the Tartars seized the throne without some of his family joining in it. What misery there was in Ireland, in Scotland, and in some parts of

<sup>1</sup> I have never heard of the Taipings being charged with the cruelty and torturing so common with the Imperialists.



England, when Cromwell's troopers were let loose ; but it was to the result of the work of these men that we owe much of the liberty we now enjoy.

I have already given instances proving that the Imperialists were the chief devastators in the Canton province, and at Amoy and Soochow ; and as " nothing was seen of burning " in that city when the rebels were in possession, the chief destruction was the act of the Imperialists. The plundering of the place may also be attributed to them, for they first sacked it and then made off when the insurgents came.<sup>1</sup> The chief authority at Shanghai received orders to seize the soldiers that came there with plunder. He was to take their plunder from them and send the soldiers to join the army that was being formed. The *Times* has charged the insurgents with all this destruction, and a great deal more. Mr. Cooke, who was correspondent for the *Times* in China, and who now, I understand, writes most of the articles on China in that newspaper, taxed the insurgents with the grandest crime that could have been committed in the way of destruction. He says that " the ruin of those works, which are to the Chinese what their dams are to the Dutch, mark where the rebels are and where they have been." Thus attributing to them the drying up of the Grand Canal and the changing of the course of the Hoang Ho, when the fact is that the Grand Canal was impassable two years *before* the insurgents took Nankin or got as far north as the Canal, and that in their marches towards Peking and return south *they did not even go near* the Canal where it is in ruins. In fact, they could not make use of it to go the most direct route to Peking, on account of it being impassable. I have stated this before, in writing and in public. I have also proved, by bringing evidence to bear, that these acts of destruction, so damaging to the insurgents when cast upon them, are entirely

<sup>1</sup> The reports received since last mail place beyond a doubt the fall of Soochow. Rebel reinforcements, advancing, apparently in no great number, from the south, had raised the siege of Nanking towards the end of May. The Imperialist soldiery or militia, who, it is alleged, had been unpaid for some months, flung away their arms and retreated in disorder upon various cities along the canal in their rear ; these they sacked. The authorities, dismayed, it is supposed, at the collisions between these deserters and the people whom they were pillaging, fled. At Soochow the struggle was most serious, and ended in the murder of the Governor of the province, as well as several others of official rank, and in the destruction of the wealthy suburbs of that city, with untold loss of life and property. The city itself was believed to be in the hands of these marauders, no longer amenable to the control of any one, on the 1st instant, and to have been occupied by rebels from Nanking on the 3d instant.—From the *Shanghai Market Report*, 14th June.

false, that Mr. Cooke and the *Times* had received wrong information. Of course I was not going to make these contradictions without informing the *Times* direct of its errors; but it allows them still to stand without correcting them, and the only argument it has used to refute them is to tax Mr. Meadows, all the missionaries, and myself, as "prejudiced partisans," because we write in favour of a cause of which we knew something, and of which the *Times* chooses to remain in ignorance. "Prejudiced partisans!" Because we try to get fair play for the Chinese—because we contradict misstatements and tell the truth, in hopes of doing good—because we expose the dangerous policy of our officials in trying to support a dynasty which they themselves know and declare the worthlessness of—because we support men who are willing to be our friends and who are anxious to spread Christianity,—and because we condemn the acts of a Government infamous for its treachery and cruelty! Why should we be partisans? But there are reasons why those who are opposed to our views *are* partisans. Their acts have proved their partisanship; and Mr. Wade and Mr. Lay, who have been the chief informants of our plenipotentiaries, telling them everything they could against the insurgents, must be partisans, for, having been officers in the pay and employ of the Tartar Government, they have actually been of the party. Their influence may be traced in the assertions of Sir John Bowring, Captain Osborne, Mr. Oliphant, Mr. Cooke, and Lord Elgin, for they have been the chief informants of all these, and it is therefore to one partisan source alone that nearly all the libels against the insurgents may be traced. To defend the errors Sir John Bowring was led into it has been almost necessary for him to burk inquiry, by openly condemning the insurgents as much as he could. At public meetings he loses no opportunity of doing so; and since his return to this country I can trace his hand in articles that have been printed about China, in which a general system of abuse has been levelled at the insurgents. I do not find any particular instances brought to bear upon the subject in support of his argument, but he and others write in this strain:—"But is there nothing to hope from the Taiping movement? Nothing. It has become little better than dacoity; its progress has been everywhere marked by wreck and ruin; it destroys cities, but builds none; consumes wealth, and produces none; supersedes one despotism by another more crushing and grievous; subverts rude religion by another full of the vilest frauds and boldest blas-

phemies. It has cast off none of the proud, insolent, and ignorant formulas of imperial rule; but, claiming to be a Divine revelation, exacts the same homage, and demands the same tribute, from western nations, to which the Government of Peking pretended in the days of its highest and most widely recognised authority." If it were not necessary to state all this against the insurgents for self-justification, we would find another reason (and, perhaps, the one which guided Sir John Bowring and Lord Elgin's policy) in the sentence which follows the above condemnation:—"We cannot afford to overthrow the Government of China." Probably, therefore, he would reason that we cannot afford that it should be overthrown.

I would ask what cities have the Mantchoos built in China? what wealth have they produced? was there ever a despotism more absolute and sanguinary than theirs? Is it not they who have issued proclamations against Christianity, and discouraged any religion? is it not they who form the example of pride and presumption? and even now we have to *force* them to receive us. Did we not find Peking falling into decay, and the Government buildings in the capital as wretched as those at Canton? Is not Han Kow (the principal commercial mart in the empire) rebuilt in a remarkable manner, the houses being without the usual shrines, this being done so as to agree with the insurgents' views?<sup>1</sup>

There is a regular system adopted by all those Government officers who write against the Taipings to hide any good there may be in the movement, and evidently not to seek for it. The Chinese insurgents are taxed with being "parricides," because they fight against the Tartars, who have usurped the sovereignty of the Chinese empire. Everything is exaggerated against them. Take, for instance, this statement in *Chambers's Journal* of January this year; and I have little doubt who the author is:—"Before the sanguinary insurrection of the Taipings scourged the land, the porcelain trade alone required thousands of junks; Nankin had a million of operatives employed in the potteries. . . . But 'celestial virtue' and his plundering hordes have held Nankin for more than two years—have ruined its trade and butchered its people." The whole statement is false, and is meant to make people infer even greater falsehoods. Nankin has been held for nearly eight years; the people that were killed when it was taken were the Tartars. The statement that a million of people were engaged in the potteries there is simply ridiculous, and the in-

<sup>1</sup> Oliphant's *Lord Elgin's Mission*, vol. ii. p. 409.

ference that the writer would wish his readers to draw is that the Taipings had only held the place for a little more than two years, and had butchered a million of people ! The insurgents now hold it without opposition from the land side ; and it may be remarked that when they first arrived at Nankin their forces numbered 60,000 men, having increased to that number from the original small congregation of God-worshippers ; and now their forces cannot be correctly estimated, they hold so many cities ! Mr. Meadows mentions that the insurgents levied black-mail on the people by making them give up gold and silver ornaments ; but the people who told him this stated that they destroyed nothing, and did not interfere with the women. This was close to Chin Kiang. “ I saw the women,” he says, “ sitting at their work as if no war was near.” Dr. Taylor says that the city of Chin Kiang had suffered severely, as the insurgents took the wood-work of the shops to help in making batteries ; but he tells that those few people who had remained in the city when the place was taken were well cared for. The people are told all sorts of stories about the insurgents, and dare not remain in a place taken by them unless they are willing to take up arms and join their ranks. Until the empire is conquered they would be obliged to act on the defensive. This many, very naturally, are unwilling to do. Frequently, however, the suicide is committed ; and we unfortunately see this in places we take. Here is an extract from a letter at Pehtang, where the very man who saved many lives, by pointing out the mines, attempted suicide and destroyed his family :—“ Women have been found hung, smothered in large boxes, and otherwise killed, to prevent them falling into the hands of the ravisher. I suppose it is the scene that occurs in all the Chinese towns captured by rebels or Imperialists, and I grieve that Christians should be no better than barbarian heathens in this respect.”

The Rev. Mr. Edkins, who was one of the first to visit the Taipings when they took Soochow, states—“ A great deal has been said about the cruelty of the ‘ long-haired rebels,’ but this is a false accusation. In no instance have we witnessed any traces of wilful destruction. It is true they kill, but it is because they must do so or submit to be killed. They burn, but, so far as our observation went, it is invariably in self-defence ; much of the burning is done by the Imperialists before the arrival of the rebels, and the cases of suicide are far more numerous than those of murder. The fact that all the women have been allowed to leave Sung-Kiang, and that they (the



rebels) are known in many cases to have made attempts to save men and women who had plunged themselves into the canals and rivers, is a proof that they are not the cruel, relentless marauders that they have been represented by many." No doubt this civil war does great harm, and the longer it is prolonged the greater misery will there be; but, I ask, is it our policy to help the Tartars, who would massacre every one they found in cities that had been in possession of the insurgents, and stamp out and burn out every vestige of the religion which is meant to be Christian; or should we not rather try to purify the new religion, and endeavour to establish true Christianity in the land, by the help of those Chinese who are willing to be Christians?

I shall make some more remarks on statements which have appeared in some journals in this country, evidently with an endeavour to disparage the rebels. Some contain no truth in them. A writer in *All the Year Round* has informed the public that "the rebels in Nankin ate their wives when pressed by famine." Now, what authority has he for such a statement? The *Examiner* and *Saturday Review* have been very bitter against the Taipings, clearly from not having a full knowledge of circumstances, and certainly not thinking of what the Imperialists are. Even when the insurgents receive a missionary, and pay some attention to his advice, the *Saturday Review* sneers both at them and the missionary. I do not advocate missionary interference in political matters; but is not a great step made in advance when we can get the Chinese to pay any attention to missionary teaching, even if unfortunately it should be from a Roberts, instead of a Muirhead, a Bridgman, or a Douglas?

In a former chapter, I think that I have done much to overthrow the argument that the Taipings adopted the Christian religion in order to curry favour with foreigners. Still there is no doubt that lately they have endeavoured to show that they wish to be friendly with them. When they advanced on Shanghai they came to foreign houses far detached from the foreign settlement—places quite unguarded. Here is an extract from a letter written on the spot:—

"Some of them entered one of the foreign houses at the south gate, and treated the inmates with the greatest kindness and civility. Having told the gentleman who was present not to be afraid, the chief of the party asked him if he worshipped Shang-ti (God). He replied, 'Yes, I worship God; and have come here to exhort the people to do the same.' 'That is right,' said he; 'you have nothing to fear from



us.' Then he took a slip of paper, which he requested the gentleman to fasten to his door. It reads thus:—'The Chung Wang Li commands that the houses of foreigners at Shanghai are not to be injured by his officers and soldiers; should any one disobey, he will be beheaded.' This is, doubtless, their fixed policy towards foreigners. They have no desire to come into collision with foreigners, and are apparently determined to treat us respectfully, fire and shell them as much as we please. The foreign houses at the South Gate, Mr. Wardner's house at the West Gate, and the Roman Catholic establishment at Zee-ka-wei, are still standing, though nothing could be easier than to convert them into burning heaps were the insurgents so disposed. It is reported that a Roman Catholic priest was killed by them at Zee-ka-wei. It is much to be regretted that this should have occurred. We are convinced, however, it was done in ignorance of his real character. Wearing the Chinese dress, it is possible that he was taken for a Chinaman, and dealt with as any other Chinaman would have been dealt with in similar circumstances; or there may be some other reasons, of which we are ignorant, which fully exculpate them of the guilt of having designedly killed a foreigner. When it was discovered that they were real rebels, orders were given to fire on them. They waved the hand, begged our officers not to fire, and stood there motionless, wishing, doubtless, to open communication and explain their object. No notice was taken of this, but a heavy fire of rifles and grape was kept up on them for about two hours, when they retired, with a loss estimated by some at forty, and by others at two hundred. No reliance can be placed on numbers, as the dead and wounded were carefully carried away ere their number could be ascertained. Whether many or few, the death of these men can be regarded in no other light than foul murder, committed, not by our soldiers who were immediately engaged in the perpetration of this vile deed, but by that will which set this infernal machine in motion. Such deeds as this make us blush, and hide our face in the dust. Our Christianity and civilisation are made contemptible in the eyes of the heathen. Our national character is degraded, and our fame tarnished by such a perverse and mean display of brute force. These men may be too weak, should they wish it, to return evil for evil; but the day of retribution will surely come, when what is sown now in the wind shall be reaped in the whirlwind."

The Italian priest reported killed was not killed at Zee-ka-wei,

though I believe that one was actually killed at some other place, whether by the insurgents or local robbers we shall perhaps never ascertain. The Taiping General posted the following proclamation at the Catholic Chapel at Zee-ka-wei (six miles from Shanghai). It is addressed to his troops:—

“The Chung Wang herewith commands his officers and soldiers, that they may all be thoroughly acquainted with it. Having received the heavenly decree to lead my soldiers everywhere to fight, the soldiers have already come to Shanghai, and have pitched their tent at the chapel. Now it is ordained that not the *minutest particle of foreign property is to be injured*. The veteran soldiers are supposed to be acquainted with the heavenly religion, that foreigners, together with the subjects of the celestial dynasty, all worship God, and equally reverence Jesus, and that all are to be regarded as brethren (or to belong to the body of brethren). The veteran soldiers will surely not dare to offend. But I have been thinking that the soldiers who have but recently joined us are ignorant of this being a place of worship, and are unable thoroughly to understand that their religion is one with, and their doctrine has the same origin as ours; hence the propriety of issuing this command. Because of this, all the soldiers, whether veterans or otherwise, are commanded to be fully aware that, hereafter, should any one be found guilty of injuring the property, goods, houses, or chapels of foreigners, it is decreed that he will be decapitated without mercy. Let all tremble and obey. Don't disobey this command.” 7th month, 15th day.

The *Atlas* says:—“Even if we grant that the people commit suicide on the approach of the Taipings, the fact remains that they prefer death by their own hands to death by that of their enemies; and it is equally clear from this admission that the feeling of the populace is not in favour of the marauders, but utterly against them. When they appear the villagers withdraw. *The men in the towns defend themselves to the last, and, finding the fortune of war against them, put an end to their existence rather than fall into the hands of their foes.* Such are the features of this pseudo-Christian movement, as painted by its admirers.” The words in italics are entirely imaginary. The principal opposition shown has been by the Tartar troops, and even they sometimes made but a feeble resistance. We know that Soochow, one of the largest cities in China, was taken without the people offer-

ing any opposition. Recent news from that place will be found below.<sup>1</sup> The people know by experience what will be their fate if they remain in a city when the insurgents take it, and it again falls into the hands of the Imperialists. They vacate the place until pretty certain of the insurgents' success, and they are sometimes not permitted to return until the insurgents feel certain there will be no opposition. At one city (Shauking), the *Pekin Gazette* stated, that 30,000 people were killed *after* the insurgents left. The accounts of Chin-kiang and Kewkiang, as told by Mr. Oliphant, show what a desert the Imperialists make of the cities they recover. Will any reasonable man say that the feeling of the populace is against the insurgents, when the power of the latter, beginning with a few men in Kwangsi, has grown into a mighty force, holding very extended power in a country with 400,000,000 of inhabitants? If the populace were against them, would they not have been annihilated long ago? Would the villagers merely withdraw when their armies were passing, and would they resort to places occupied by them to trade and sell produce? People in this country *will* not understand that in China there is very little reliable information to be procured by the Chinese people. They have not electric telegraphs and newspapers to tell them all that is taking place. They live in doubt and uncertainty while civil war is going on around them; the only certain thing they know is that they incur the penalty of death from their Government if they are found consorting with the insurgents. Europeans residing in China have to

<sup>1</sup> The insurgents at Soochow seem to be settling down to a somewhat civilized life. Some of the unfortunate inhabitants have been induced to return to their homes, and something like the commencement of trade is beginning to develop itself. Shops for the sale of edibles of various kinds are to be met with; cloth, especially of foreign manufacture, is eagerly sought after; stores of winter-clothing are offered freely enough for sale; in fact, a good amount of confidence has been restored, and money is circulating without much hindrance. Very severe laws are posted with regard to robbery in the city and places conquered by the Changmaos (Taipings); and according to Chinese information some very severe examples have been made. There seems to be no lack of silver among the insurgents, although we believe that, by their rules, no man can hold personally either sycee or coin, the precious metals in these shapes being the peculiar property of his Most Holy Lordship the Heavenly King. Rice shops were formerly Government monopolies at Soochow and other cities occupied by the insurgents, but some change seems to have been made now, for we hear of private stores for the sale of this commodity at very cheap rates. Altogether the rebels seem more flourishing than ever.—Extracted from Hong Kong Overland Trade Report.

be guided by facts which they *know rather than by any Chinese information*.

Lord Elgin writes concerning the difficulty of getting correct information from the Chinese:—"It is always their chief endeavour to say what they suppose their questioner will be most pleased to hear." If, therefore, Lord Elgin's interpreters, in speaking to the natives, called a Taiping soldier a rebel, which in the Chinese word is equivalent to a murdering thief, they would have their cue, and abuse the insurgents accordingly. Lord Elgin says:—"It is, no doubt, true that the general attitude of the population does not argue much enthusiasm on either side of the dynastic controversy; and it is also certain that we saw more of the districts in Imperialist than of those in rebel occupation." These statements serve to show that Lord Elgin deserves credit for his justice and candour, and that his errors may be attributed chiefly to his interpreters, who are Imperialists.

The *Atlas* gives an extract from an insurgent proclamation, threatening extermination to the people of Shanghai if they do not submit, but, with an unfairness which characterizes nearly all the opponents to the Taipings, it omits the passages which show the reason why the threat is made:—"Our peaceful messengers have been executed;" and it also omits the passage which states that if no resistance is made "not a fraction will be exacted from you." Are we to suppose that a Chinese army is to march on a place without making any threat to induce submission and prevent a contest? And, after all, have we not good evidence to show that some of the Chinese at Shanghai were expected to rise in favour of the insurgents? <sup>1</sup> It may be all very well to say that those Chinese who were expected to rise were ill-disposed, and not loyal. Certainly they were not loyal, but is it for us to judge of their disposition and loyalty, and suppress any attempt at rebellion? I give the translation of the proclamation issued by the British minister. The French one was similar, except that the translation given of it says that the French would put down any insurrectionary movement in the *interior*. But I doubt the truth of such a translation, and imagine that the same words in Chinese were employed as those used in the British proclamation. Is this neutrality?

"The undersigned issues this special proclamation to tranquillize the minds of the people.

<sup>1</sup> Shanghai *Market Report* for August 1860, quoted in the author's *Letter to Lord John Russell*.



“ Shanghai is a port open to foreign trade, and the native dealers residing therein have large transactions with the foreigners who resort to the place to carry on their business. Were it to become the scene of attack and of civil war, commerce would receive a severe blow, and the interests of those, whether foreign or native, who wish to pursue their peaceful avocations in quiet, would suffer great loss.

“ The undersigned will therefore call upon the Commanders of Her Majesty’s naval and military authorities to take proper measures to prevent the inhabitants of Shanghai from being exposed to massacre and pillage, *and to lend their assistance to put down any insurrectionary movement among the ill-disposed, and to protect the city against any attack.*

“ *Shanghai, 26th May 1860.*”

Mr. Bruce’s excuse will probably rest upon “ instructions from home;” for I have reason to believe that, after Shanghai had been taken in 1853 by the Triad rebels, who were an isolated band, quite unconnected with the Taipings, the British Government, upon Sir John Bowring’s representations, sent out instructions that the ports open to foreign trade were to be protected from any similar *local* rising. This was no doubt right, but it is quite a different thing when the forces of the power holding nearly all the rest of the province come to take possession, declaring its friendliness to foreigners, and when we were at war with the Government it intended to dispossess.

So far as I can gather, from letters and Chinese newspapers placed at my disposal, some of the foreign residents at Shanghai feared that the insurgents intended to attack the foreign settlement. Their proclamations were posted in the foreign settlement, where they could be put up in safety. Any attempt to post them in the city would have been most dangerous, as a strict watch was kept, and all rebels taken were marched out and executed (the neutral allies garrisoning the place). Some of the foreign residents were in great fear. The *North China Herald*, the British Government organ at Shanghai, said, “ John Bull is at last thoroughly aroused. The posting of the proclamation was all that was needful to dispel his remaining doubts as to the proximity of danger.” . . . “ A rebel,” it says, “ is easier to hit than a pheasant or a snipe.” But when the rebels did come (their letters being returned unanswered) they approached the city by the point the most remote from the foreign settlement, and, as I have



said before, were fired on as soon as they came within range of the allies in the city.<sup>1</sup> The *North China Herald* tells us, "Our real danger is from *within*. Those who know the state of the settlement best tell us that we have several thousand disorderly vagabonds quartered among us, either accomplices of the rebels, or fellows ready to take advantage of any opportunity to burn, plunder, and destroy." . . . "Any *Chinese Official* can point them out." What was the upshot of all this? It is evident that Chinese in the place were expected to favour the insurgents. The insurgents came, they went, and no attempt was made to root out these "disorderly vagabonds." They made no sign; in fact, they proved *not to be* disorderly vagabonds. There was a fire a short time after this. Many Chinese houses were destroyed. A number of disorderly vagabonds plundered the houses, insulted the women most grossly, at a time when certainly they deserved some commiseration. These disorderly vagabonds were all Europeans! It is thus we protect the Chinese. We malign them undeservedly, and then commit the very crimes we falsely tax them with.

I am not writing to condemn foreigners in China at the expense of the Chinese, but I write in hope that good may be done by exposing some of the foreigners' unjustifiable acts, and by showing that it is only interested or ignorant people who try to blacken the Chinese character. There is a great deal more good in it than most people imagine. There are many of the newspapers in England which publish articles upon China founded merely on the political crotchets they wish to support, and often in utter ignorance of the real state of affairs.

But there is a plan adopted by some papers purposely to vilify the rebels. One newspaper published the following as a translation of a rebel proclamation:—"The Father and the Elder Brother set us to rule the Heavenly Kingdom (China), to sweep away and exterminate the devilish spirits—foreign younger brethren of the Western Ocean." Now, a fair fight I can undertake; but is this fair? It was evidently the intention of the writer to lead people to believe that the insurgents wished to exterminate Europeans.

The actual words,<sup>2</sup> as I find them, are:—

"The Father and Elder Brother set us to rule the Heavenly

<sup>1</sup> The foreign settlement is quite separate from the city of Shanghai.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Elgin's Mission, *Blue Book*, p. 473.

Kingdom (China), to sweep away and exterminate the devilish spirits : *bestowing on us great honour.*

“ Foreign younger brethren of the Western Ocean, listen to our words !

“ Join us,” etc.

At first I thought the error might only be punctuation, but on a closer examination I find that those words which I have put in italics are omitted on purpose, to lead the public to believe that the insurgents intended to exterminate foreigners. Other points in the same article were nearly as bad.

Ignorance about Chinese affairs is excusable ; but when such statements as the above may encourage the British Government in its anti-rebel policy, they are leading to something worse than murder, for it is bearing false witness to murder men innocent of the charge imputed to them.



Supplement.

---

BRITISH POLICY IN CHINA

NEUTRAL WAR AND WARLIKE PEACE!

BY JOHN SCARTH.

“ We thwart the Deity ; and, 'tis decreed  
Who thwart His will shall contradict their own.”  
*YOUNG'S Night Thoughts.*

EDINBURGH :

EDMONSTON AND DOUGLAS.

1861.





## SUPPLEMENT.

---

MANDERSTON, BERWICKSHIRE, *February 28th.*

THE last intelligence received from China so fully supports some of my statements, that I have been induced to add a short supplement to the pamphlet issued a few days since.

The Rev. Griffith John and the Rev. M. Kleockers were well received by the Taiping chiefs at Nankin, and upon their representation an edict was issued for the toleration of Christianity. This I publish, together with some remarks made upon it by Dr. Bridgman. Some of the expressions in it are difficult to understand; however, the edict clearly shows that Christianity is meant to be the religion of the insurgents.

The account given of the state of Nankin and the insurgents there is very interesting.

It appears that before the siege of Nankin was raised, and the Imperial army utterly defeated last spring, the Taipings found that their supplies were waning fast, and that they could scarcely depend upon holding the city for more than ten or twenty days. Taiping Wang "exerted his utmost to inspire the kings, and, through them, the people, with confidence: 'The Heavenly Father reigneth, the Elder Brother bears our burden; fear not, deliverance will come in good time.' Thus spake the chief, when clouds were gathering thick and fast over and around the city, and grim despair was staring them in the face. Just at this moment the kings Ying and Chung came, the former from the north, and the latter from the south, and completely shut in the Imperialists." A great victory was gained; and, as one of Mr. John's guides said to him, "Who could have wrought this but the Heavenly Father? None other than the Heavenly Father could have done it." Mr. John writes:—"This the insurgents speak of as one of the most marvellous deliverances that God hath wrought for them. And the King Kan regards it as proving, beyond the possi

bility of a doubt, that the chief is truly the "Son of Heaven"—that is, the Heaven-appointed Emperor of China. The royal seal has been changed in consequence. It seems that, whilst they were so closely besieged, the celestial king ordered the following verse to be sung by the chief officer and soldiers, whenever they would feel their hearts give way to fears :—

(*Translation*).

'Our Heavenly Father, God, mightily reigneth;  
Therefore the celestial dynasty shall stand for ever and for ever.  
Our Heavenly Elder Brother, Christ, mightily bears our burden;  
Therefore the celestial hall is full of glory, for ever full of glory.'

"This verse is now engraved on the golden seal, in commemoration of this wonderful deliverance and victory, the glory of which they ascribe to the heavenly Father and Elder Brother. We entered the city at the south gate. The entrance is magnificent, and the walls are by far the finest that I have ever seen. Here we parted with the kind officer that had led us from Kei-yung. We thanked him for his kindness and attention. 'Don't mention it,' said he; 'are we not Lung pau ti huing (brethren of the same womb)?'"

This last expression may account for the forced translation given by Mr. Wade when he states that Taiping calls Christ his *uterine brother*, a translation which is evidently meant to be offensive. It seems certain that it is not intended to be used in any other than a metaphorical sense, though, no doubt, the chief claims to be a specially adopted child of God, and in this way increases his hold on the affections or the fears of his followers; but he does not permit any worship to be paid to himself. He expressly ordered the Kan Wang "to inform the foreign brethren that they are greatly mistaken in supposing that he is worshipped as God, and to assure them that he had never requested, or even had thought of such a thing." In Mr. Meadows' work there is the translation of an Imperial edict issued at Yungnan stating that only God and Christ are holy, and that they only are to be so addressed; yet notwithstanding this, some people seem to be eager and anxious to find out errors in the doctrines of the insurgents, and, strange to say, those most ready to do so are the very men who some time ago had the best opportunity to correct any errors that might have prevailed.

"The Kan Wang," says Mr. Griffith John, "told us that the

celestial king was in the habit of teaching his Kwang-si disciples that God and Christ were very near to them, to watch over them, to guide them in all their ways, and to protect them from all danger. Hence he would exhort them to use the terms Heavenly Father, Heavenly Elder Brother, rather than God and Christ. The doctrine of the fatherhood of God and brotherhood of Christ had a most wonderful effect on the minds of the officers and soldiers. It fired them with wonderful enthusiasm, and inspired them with a courage which nothing could overcome." Mr. Griffith John's account of the visit to Nankin is written as a diary, and his opinions on one day differ considerably from those of another; and in this way, it is necessary to take into account, he hears the opinions of many different persons. There is evidently an intention on the part of Taiping to impress his followers with the belief of his mission being direct from God, and probably he himself believes in the dreams or visions which brought about this wonderful revolution, and that he has actually received a new revelation. So long as he does not require direct worship to be paid to himself, and gives all the glory to God, there is perhaps little to object to in this, for it certainly gains importance to himself and his cause, and no doubt helps him to carry out his plan of Christianizing China. The great pity is that no attempt has been made to correct the errors before they went as far as they do, and have made him a fanatic who might be dangerous. But as he takes the Bible for his guide, it is to be hoped that eventually it may be used to counteract the self-important notions which he has assumed. Some of his followers have a very high opinion of him, and say that he is divinely intelligent. Though God is classed as the Father, and Christ as the Elder Brother, and he takes to himself the next rank among the children of God, he says, "Father must be superior to son, and the elder brother must be far superior to the younger brother. This is an important distinction, based upon the immutable laws of relationship." According to Chinese ideas, it is most important; but as it is stated by the young prince, in the edict for toleration, that "the whole world, together with my father and myself, are one family," we must not impute the assumption to blasphemy.

As it may be interesting to know the opinions of some of the chiefs, I extract the following:—

King Tsan is a Kwangsi man, and has been a follower of the Celestial King from the beginning. "When we first heard the gospel

in Kwangsi, our hearts were very warm. *Then we had no thoughts of this world's power and grandeur.* We only thought of preparing ourselves for Heaven. I knew nothing of God, or how to worship Him, before I was taught by the Celestial King. He taught me the folly of idolatry, the unity of God, and how to worship the true God acceptably. He used to teach us, that, in worshipping God, the heart, a sincere heart, was all-important; and that the practice of offering tea, meats, &c., in religious services is useless. He would often exhort us to seek the influences of the Holy Spirit to change and sanctify our hearts. All my family, with the exception of one son, forsook me on account of my religion and my devotedness to the cause." He spoke of Christ's merits as sufficient to cover all sin, and of His blood as efficacious to wash away all guilt. "What would have been the use," said he, "of an old sinner such as I to trust in any merits of my own." He told us how they, when only 200 men, and completely surrounded by 3000 Imperialists, were delivered by the Heavenly Father; how the Southern King went about from town to town and village to village, in Kwangsi, preaching the gospel, and establishing churches. What a fine character was the old king, he said; "he used to carry the lame and the feeble on his back over streams and rivers, and gave his horse to the aged rather than ride himself."

Mr. John says—"We paid a visit to King Chang, at whose palace the Rev. Mr. Holmes was entertained during his stay in the city. We found in him a very free and agreeable sort of man." In reference to the visions of the Eastern and Western Kings, he observed, that it was hard for foreigners to believe in them, and that, in fact, there are not a few among themselves of those who did not witness the marvellous things God wrought for and by them at the commencement of the movement, who do not believe in them. "But," said he, "I wish you to tell the foreign brethren, that these are my views. You, foreign brethren, have had the gospel for more than 1800 years, but we have had it only, as it were, 8 days. Your knowledge must be correct and extensive; ours must necessarily be imperfect and limited. You must bear with us for a season, and gradually we shall improve. As for the gospel, it is one; and the foreign brethren may rest assured that we are determined to uproot idolatry out of the land, and plant Christianity in its stead."

Some of the officers even believed in miracles being performed by the Celestial King, and appeared to consider him second only to Christ.



All the idols have been destroyed, and nearly all the fine temples in Nankin. "There is nothing in the whole of this vast city to remind one of idolatry. *I don't think that there is such a thing as an idol or idol-worship in the city. Probably this can be said of no other city in China.* There is no public tobacco and opium smoking, nor spirit drinking in the city. All these are strictly forbidden; and though I know that both tobacco and opium are smoked, and spirits drunk by not a few, yet it is done so secretly, that not the faintest sign of either is to be observed in the streets. *Everywhere they are busy in rebuilding the place.* They employ every carpenter and mason they can find for this purpose. Shops of every description, on a small scale, are open, and in some parts a good deal of business is going on. I was particularly struck with the fine and healthy appearance of the women and children. Most of the women have large feet, and all have them unbound. This will, to some extent, account for the superiority of their general appearance to all other Chinese women I have seen. In the morning, the women and the children take their morning walks or rides, as the case may be. They ride astride. The chair seems to have been thrown aside altogether, or nearly so."

Mr. John further states, that the other cities in possession of the insurgents are at present mere camps, and those in the province of Kiangsoo will likely remain so as long as Chinkiang foo is held by the Imperialists, and Shanghai garrisoned for the Tartar Emperor by British and French troops in addition to the imperial soldiers; but of Nankin he says, "It is as habitable as any other Chinese city I know of." The Taipings appear to be in undisputed possession, and they claim at present the greater part of six provinces, the very best in China—Kiangsoo, Honan, Nganwhui, Kiangsi, Szechuen, and Kwangsi.

They have set aside the Confucian classics as *text books*, and the themes for the examinations are now generally selected from the Old and New Testaments! The Kan wang (Hung Jin) is examiner, for which post he is peculiarly well suited, from instructions received under the Protestant missionaries at Hong Kong and Shanghai. He presented Mr. Griffith John with an essay, "very well written and very scriptural upon the whole." The theme is, "The Fall and the Deluge."

Since the first part of the pamphlet, *Neutral War and Warlike Peace*, was published, I have obtained possession of the *Blue Book*, containing correspondence respecting affairs in China, 1859-1860.



It so thoroughly confirms many of my statements that I will refer to it in proof of their correctness, though I have already given other authorities.

Pages 60 and 62 confirm that the Imperialists burnt the suburbs of Hangchow and Soochow.

Page 60 confirms the plundering done by the Imperial troops.

Page 66 do. do., and that they brought their plunder to Shanghai.

Page 60 confirms that the Imperial authorities solicited our assistance and that it was granted. They even tried to induce Mr. Bruce to send troops to Soochow. The French general even agreed to do so.

(All the correspondence about British troops being sent some distance into the interior on the 26th June is omitted, as is also the correspondence with the Imperial authorities relative to our being paid for thus assisting them. The duties were reduced one-half on that very day. I find no mention of this important fact in the *Blue Book*.)

Page 66 proves that we protected Shanghai against the insurgents for fear of the Imperial troops taking advantage of the insurgents' attack to plunder the place!

The whole tenor of Mr. Bruce's letters, and of Mr. Wade's communications, show the animus that existed against the insurgents. They serve to prove, too, that Mr. Wade, from his information, derived from Imperial sources, not only provided Mr. Bruce with information, but furnished the same sort of information to the public press. So that, as I have said before, nearly all the information that the Government and the public have had has been from one source. There is only one newspaper in Shanghai, and the other papers in China take all their news of the insurrection from it, and that paper is the British Government official organ!

Judging by what is published in the *Blue Book*, Mr. Bruce appears to have sought for all intelligence he could obtain the most unfavourable to the insurgents. He gives old wives' tales, and the narrative of an American missionary, and his crude translations, in preference to the information *which he was in possession of*, and which was obtained by English missionaries of known learning and repute. Even when the British interpreters give information, showing that others than insurgents are committing the destruction (see page 161 of *Blue Book*), Mr. Bruce still charges the Taipings with it; and in a place

with a population of at least 400,000 people, he publishes the petition of thirty, who acknowledged the advantage of foreign assistance,—an advantage which the Imperial authorities made no mention of, but took all the credit to themselves. While Mr. Bruce wishes to uphold his acts, and justify his policy by maligning the insurgents and disparaging them in every possible way, there can be no real neutrality in China, and the British Government will be answerable for the continuance of the anarchy and disorder which exists, for it is only prolonged by our partial assistance. The translation of the Imperial edict,<sup>1</sup> published the day before the prisoners were captured at Tungchow, proves the enmity and hatred of the Tartar Government. And I declare, in the most solemn manner, that the policy which Mr. Bruce would advocate in upholding that Government must burden Great Britain with heavy responsibilities, must thwart our missionaries in doing good, and though the people in this country may be told that we are neutral, such is not the case, for BRITISH TROOPS ARE AT PRESENT ACTUALLY SUBSIDIZED BY THE TARTARS,<sup>2</sup> and their assistance is even charged for when we were at war with the Government they assist!! Truly this is “neutral war and warlike peace!” We assist a Government which Lord Elgin admits is the poorest in the world, “owing to its weakness and maladministration.”<sup>3</sup> Assist it against men who wish to make China a Christian nation!

If what I have stated has not interested my readers, perhaps those papers called for by Lord Grey in the House of Lords may add to the interest I would wish every one in this country to take in China. The papers show (if I may judge of the reports of them that have appeared in the London journals, for I have not seen these papers themselves) that Mr. Bruce has entered into an arrangement for British vessels to go up the Yang-tsze Kiang, to places beyond that portion of the river held by the Taipings, and that each vessel may be armed in such a way as the Imperial authorities shall think reasonable for her protection against the insurgents, and that full duty shall be charged upon her cargo by the Imperialists at Chinkiang-foo or Shanghai. Further than this, a notification has been issued, stating that passports will be granted for British subjects to go to any part of China, except such places as are held by the insurgents. That there may be no mistake regarding this statement, so evidently partial to the Imperialists, I give particulars for reference.

<sup>1</sup> *Blue Book*, p. 207.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 250.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 270.

“Further correspondence respecting affairs in China has just been presented to the House of Lords. It relates exclusively to the opening of the two ports of Han-kau and Kiu-Kiang, in the Yang-tsze, to foreign trade. Mr. Bruce writes to Lord John Russell on Dec. 2, 1860, that under the treaty of Tien-tsin we had technically no right to insist on the immediate opening of the river; but the capture of Soo-chow by the insurgents, and the bearing of this incident and of the progress of the rebellion particularly on the import trade, rendered it most desirable to find an uninterrupted channel of communication with the western provinces of China.

“In furtherance of this object, a correspondence took place between Mr. Bruce and Prince Kung. Mr. Bruce informs the Prince that he regards it as expedient that, for the present, but two ports should be opened, namely, Han-kau and Kiu-Kiang; and in order to the prevention of abuses in the present disturbed state of the river, he would propose that the trade with these be carried on under the following regulations:—All duties leviable, under the new tariff, upon import or export cargoes on board British vessels proceeding up or down the river, will be payable at Shanghai or Ching-kiang-foo, and the customs authorities will take such steps as seem to them necessary for the enforcement of this rule. Every British vessel proceeding up or down the river shall be permitted to carry, for her protection, such an amount of arms and ammunition as shall appear to the Chinese customs to be reasonable; and this amount of arms and ammunition shall be entered in a certificate, to be called the “Arms Certificate,” which shall be delivered by the customs to any master of a British vessel applying for it. Any vessel trafficking in arms or ammunition, or carrying an amount of either in excess of that specified in her arms certificate, shall be liable to have her cargo confiscated, and to be prohibited from farther trading on the river.

“Mr. Bruce concludes by requesting his Highness to issue the necessary instructions. Prince Kung replies, agreeing to Mr. Bruce’s proposals. On Dec. 6, Lord Elgin writes to Lord John Russell from Shanghai, where he was engaged in considering, with the officers of the Imperial customs and some of the leading merchants, the conditions under which the opening of the river might be carried out:—

“If a legitimate trade can be established on this river, I believe that great advantage will accrue from it, both to the people of China and to the foreigners who engage in it; more especially at present,

when the communication between the producing districts and the ports on the seaboard are obstructed by the rebellion. It will go some way towards affording to the inhabitants of the interior a market and security, which are all that a Chinaman requires to render him one of the most valuable customers. But very different consequences will, I fear, ensue from this measure if smugglers and filibusters, under the protection of terror and exterritoriality, are enabled to avail themselves of this channel of communication to introduce foreign arms and recruits into the disturbed districts, and thereby to extend and perpetuate the reign of anarchy, which threatens to convert one of the most fertile regions of the earth and its industrious population into a wilderness haunted by bands of ruffians.<sup>1</sup> Irregular profits on consignments of guns and gunpowder will be dearly purchased if they are obtained by processes which will dry up the sources of production in the tea and silk-growing provinces of China. Your Lordship can well understand the anxiety which I feel to frame such regulations for the trade on the Yang-tsze as shall keep in some check, if they do not altogether prevent, this great mischief."—*From the Morning Post.*

## CONSULAR NOTIFICATION.

BRITISH CONSULATE,  
Shanghai, 2d January 1861.

The undersigned, H. B. M.'s Consul, hereby gives notice that he is prepared to issue passports, under the ninth article of the British Treaty of Tien-tsin, to such British subjects as meet the conditions stated in the subjoined circular instructions of H. M.'s Envoy and Chief Superintendent of Trade, and implied by the form of passport forwarded with those instructions, of which form a copy is also subjoined.

It will be perceived that H. M.'s Consul, in signing a passport, vouches for the known respectability of the person to whom it is issued; and that he cannot issue one to a person whose character, position, and antecedents do not afford reasonable guarantees for his good conduct.

THOS. TAYLOR MEADOWS,  
H. B. M.'s Consul.

<sup>1</sup> I do not defend any acts of violence reported against the insurgents, but I again declare that the acts of the Imperial soldiers have been proved to be more ruffian-like.—J. S.



*Passport, No.*

BRITISH CONSULATE,  
Shanghai, 186

The undersigned, Her Britannic Majesty's Consul at Shanghai, requests the Civil and Military Authorities of the Emperor of China, in conformity with the ninth article of the Treaty of Tien-tsin, to allow *A. B.*, a British subject, to travel freely, and without hindrance or molestation, in the Chinese empire, and to give him protection and aid in case of necessity.

*Mr. A. B.*, being a person of known respectability, is desirous of proceeding to (*Sze chuen and Kan suh*), and this passport is given him on condition of his not visiting the cities or towns occupied by the insurgents.

*H. B. M.'s Consul.*

This passport will remain in force for a year from the date thereof.

*Signature of the bearer:* (*A. B.*)

*Extract from a (Circular) Despatch, dated 21st November 1860,  
from H.M. Envoy and Chief Superintendent of Trade to Consul  
MEADOWS.*

"I have to impress particularly on you the necessity of not issuing passports to any British subjects who are not persons whose character, position, and antecedents afford reasonable guarantees for their good conduct.

"It is of the utmost importance to the security of foreigners in the interior that this instruction should be strictly attended to. If the bearer of the passport is guilty of any offence against the laws of the country, and is arrested, and sent to your port by the Chinese authorities, you will institute the strictest investigation into the complaint, and punish him accordingly, and no passport should be issued to him in future."

True Extract.

"J. A. WEBSTER."

The first extract I have given is from the *Morning Post*, but in the *Daily Telegraph* I find Lord Elgin's letter given more in full, though it is still only an extract. In addition to the information furnished by the *Morning Post*, I find that Lord Elgin says:—



## THE EARL OF ELGIN TO LORD JOHN RUSSELL.

(Extract.)

"SHANGHAI, Dec. 6, 1860.

"I am now engaged in considering, with the officers of the Imperial Customs in this place, and with some of the leading merchants, the conditions under which it may be practicable and expedient to open up the Yang-tsze river at once to trade. *The right to navigate it beyond Chin-kiang-foo does not in strictness arise under the treaty of Tien-tsin until the civil war, which now rages on its banks, shall have been suppressed.* The Prince of Kung has, however, as your Lordship will perceive from the correspondence, of which a copy is herewith enclosed, met in a liberal spirit Mr. Bruce's proposal to anticipate that period by a provisional arrangement."

Now, considering that Lord Elgin acknowledges that by treaty we have no right to the navigation of the great river beyond Chin-kiang-foo, and considering what was done by Lord Elgin when he went up the Yang-tsze-kiang in 1858, as related in the chapter "Our Neutrality with the Taipings"—considering, too, that Mr. Lay is the head of the Imperial Customs foreign establishment at Shanghai. I ask, do not these arrangements foreshadow an intention to lead us into difficulties with the Taipings? Observe, we are prohibited from holding intercourse with them: our vessels may be armed to fight against them; full duties are to be charged by the Imperialists, thus hinting that no duties shall be paid to the insurgents through whose territory for 200 miles the ships may have to pass. That Prince Kung leaves Mr. Bruce, who has already brought us into collision with the insurgents, "to manage matters, as, upon consideration, he shall find expedient," and that there is almost a certainty of difficulties arising, if we will not hold any intercourse with the power in possession of some of the most important passes in the river. Is there neutrality in all this?—is there any justice, and is there not an intention to pick a quarrel?

We are to act as allies with those who reject the Scriptures as *rebel books*, and are prohibited all intercourse with those Chinese who are willing to be Christians, and who hold the Holy Scriptures in the highest veneration!

I have stated my case, and I leave it to the public press of this country to support me in the cause which I advocate. I cannot

doubt the result. Are we to support the Tartars in the civil war, and help them to put down the Chinese, carrying fire, torture, death, and destruction among the myriads of would-be Christians?

The Shanghai newspaper states, that if the Yang-tsze-kiang is not opened up to foreign trade, the treaty of Tien-tsin will not be worth the paper on which it is written; and as probably Lord Elgin is well aware of its worthlessness, is this country to be driven into a war with the Taipings to give *eclât* to our treaty with the Tartars? Why not let the treaty stand on its merits, instead of making the infraction of one of its most just and righteous stipulations the means of bringing us into further difficulties,—difficulties which we can never see the end of? Even if we drove the Taipings from the banks of the great river, they would be safe when out of range of our cannon, and could march into the tea and silk districts, and stop our trade whenever they thought fit to do so.

Are our plenipotentiaries in China to have more power than the Government at home? Is neutrality in China to be interpreted differently to neutrality in Europe? For the hasty and inconsiderate rush for trade in the interior of China, are we to forget all the precepts and principles of Christianity? And is a solemn treaty, duly ratified by Her Majesty, to have important clauses taken from it at will, according to the discretion of a plenipotentiary, whose acts have already shown why he is anxious to make the public at home believe that we have enemies in the Taipings? I have great difficulty in keeping my remarks within the bounds of moderation, but no consideration for personal feeling or interested motives will likely restrain the indignation that will be generally expressed in this country when these affairs are brought to light. It is painful to write upon a subject which may be unpalatable to many, but as I have by force of circumstances been drawn into the position I have taken, to advocate the cause of the Chinese, I only regret my inability to do it more justice.

The dangers which I pointed out with regard to the clause concerning the inland transit of opium have already become apparent. The authorities at Shanghai have levied a high tax upon all opium when removed from the foreign settlement at Shanghai, and have attempted to make the Chinese (*and their families*) in foreign employ responsible for the amount collected. This has been resisted by the British consul; but the fact still exists, that an impost of about £25 per chest

for import and transit duties is to be charged on all opium imported. This is an amount which will certainly encourage smuggling into the interior; and all the difficulties and dangers arising from that traffic can now scarcely be avoided. The imperial authorities are in a certain measure justified by treaty, and also by a letter addressed by the opium dealers to the foreign community, but the latter is evidently not a spontaneous production, and is thus remarked upon in the Overland Trade Report:—"The native dealers, evidently influenced by the Chinese local authorities, have issued a circular declaring the levy of the tax to be an act of their own as a tribute to the Government, and entering a sort of protest against foreign interference in the manner of its collection, but the document is so evidently got up, that it deserves little more than just noticing."

While upon this subject, it is right to mention that the quantity and value of opium imported into China, as estimated in the chapter on opium, is considerably in excess of the amount the returns for last year will show; but the quotations received by last mail prove that on a smaller importation prices advance so as to check consumption. The statistics also show that the Chinese can do with much less opium than has at one time been consumed.

The importations of opium, for the first two weeks of January, at Hong Kong, exceeded £1,100,000 in value.

Notwithstanding all that has been said about the rebellion stopping trade, the statistics show that the export of both tea and silk to England have, during the year of the success of the Taipings, been very much larger than for any of the three years previous. We must remember, too, that while we were at war with the Tartars it was with the Chinese we did all this trade.

I shall conclude this pamphlet with an explanatory extract from the Rev. Griffith John's interesting narrative of his expedition to Nankin:—

"We happened to tell the Kan-wang, one day, that it was generally believed at Shanghai that the insurgents killed a Roman Catholic priest, when the Chùngwang came down. King Chang inquired again if such was the case. We replied that such was the report. 'Well, then,' said he, 'I wish you to make it known to all the foreign brethren that it was done without the command, or even the cognizance of the King Chùng. Why should we, who believe in the same God and Christ, wilfully murder a Roman Catholic priest? It may have been

perpetrated by local thieves. But if it was done by any of our brethren, it must have been in ignorance.' It seems that they lost about two hundred men and several officers at Shanghai. He, in common with all the others who have happened to touch upon that *iniquitous* affair, gives the English, at least, the credit of having done it in ignorance of their design. They cannot conceive how Englishmen, who profess the religion of Christ, and who have had it for so many centuries, could have committed such an infamous deed as to butcher two hundred of their men without giving them the slightest intimation of their intention to do so. It is to be sincerely hoped that such a blunder will never be committed again."

FROM NORTH CHINA HERALD, 29TH DECEMBER 1860.

*Edict for the Toleration of Christianity, given by the young prince, the eldest Son of Hung Siutsiuen, on solicitation of the Rev. GRIFFITH JOHN, the Rev. H. Z. KLOEKERS, and others, at Nankin, Nov. 1860.*

"The decree of the Heavenly Father, the Heavenly Sire, and Our Sire, has been received; and it is our pleasure to proclaim it to you, our brothers Ho and Fuh; to you our uncles Kan, Tah, Yuh, Sin, Ngan, Hien, Fu, and Chang; to you all, our younger brethren, the heavenly leaders, generals of divisions, principal magistrates and magistrates general, divine controllers, court directors, metropolitan protectors, divine leaders, members of the six boards, chief attendants; and to all our ministers, both within and without our capital, that you may know the same.

*"The true doctrine of the Father and the Sire is the heavenly Religion, and in it the Religion of Christ and the Religion of the Lord of Heaven are both included. The whole world, with Our Sire and Our Self being one family, all who kindly and lovingly conform to and keep this doctrine are permitted to come to our court.*

"From a memorial presented by our uncles, Kan, Ngan, and Chang, we see and know that Yang Tuh-sin [Rev. Mr. John] and the others, missionaries from foreign lands, deeply interested in the heavenly kingdom, reverently obedient to the Father and the Sire, and grateful for the bestowment of power and authority to effect wonderful deeds attracting the near and the remote, have come on purpose to observe these glories, to do homage to the High Ruler and to Christ, and to ask permission to propagate the true doctrine.



“ Considering that the present is a time of war, and that troops are moving in various directions, we are truly afraid that the said persons, while devoted to the propagation of religion, may sustain serious injury by the revolutionary army, to our deep regret; seeing, however, that they are really faithful men, and reckon it as nothing to suffer with Christ, we do regard them with high esteem.

“ Let our brothers and uncles, therefore, give commands that they be treated kindly and lovingly, and that there be no occasion for strife or quarrel; and let all, realizing that the Father, the Sire, our Sire, and our self are one family and one body, treat the missionaries with extraordinary courtesy. This is from the Prince.”

“ It is often asked, have the rebels any regularly organized government? And, if they have, what is it? Their long list of officers enumerated seems to me a sufficient warrant for an affirmative answer to the first. There can be no doubt that they have a regularly organized government, however much it may differ from that of the Manchus and from all that have preceded it. Many of its details are purely Chinese and well defined; others, however, seem quite new, and it is not easy to say, at present, what they are either in their theory or practice.

“ The military element enters largely into the whole great movement; and there is in it, likewise, a strong theological element, with, as the edict evinces, something friendly towards foreigners. The probability is, and I have no doubt the fact would be patent enough if they were allowed to speak freely for themselves, that these men do not yet know what precisely will be their settled and permanent forms, military, civil, and ecclesiastical. At present, and at the distance we see them, they seem less a *state* than an army or a collection of armies. It is a fact, however, that they have a *civil* as well as a military department, yet how far the two are distinct, the one from the other, I am unable to determine.

“ I have said above, and I repeat it here for the sake of emphasis, that I do not know in what sense some of the terms in the edict are employed. This is the case both in regard to the titles of the officers and to the appellatives given to the Supreme Being.

“ Yang Siutsing, the infamous Eastern King, was, evidently enough, a bold blasphemer and an impostor; but it is not so clear that these two epithets are justly applied to the deceased Southern and Western



Kings, or to Hung Siutsiun, now styled the Celestial King, TIEN WANG. With our notions of things celestial and terrestrial, there is a shocking impropriety in calling any human government or ruler *heavenly*. But men's notions, like their tastes, will differ; *and keeping in mind the very limited instruction* these men have yet had in biblical theology, *they should not be judged of by us too hastily*.

"The four distinct persons, in the edict designated *Yay, Tay, Tay, and Chan,—i.e.,* God the Father, Jesus the Saviour, Hung Siutsiuen, and his son, are declared to be *one family* and *one body*; in what sense they are so regarded is not evident; but this is evident, and I think certain, that they are declared one in quite the same sense, if not exactly the same, as in a previous clause, where the young prince says, the whole world, all its nations and individuals, with our sire, and our self, are '*one family*.'

"This may be too favourable a view of the use of the terms in question; and for the present I am not anxious to defend it. At the same time it is not only safe, but right for us, until more fully informed, to put the most favourable construction upon the language of men struggling, as they are, amid thousands of difficulties, for light and freedom.

"The composition of the edict, considered in a literary point of view, is by no means bad; on the contrary, if it be the work of the young prince, now only in his twelfth year, it certainly does him no small credit.—E.C.B."

They are an "all for ourselves in this world" association, who work like the rats in the dark, waged on by the most greivous covetousness; greedy of other men's property, jealous of every other trade,—envious of those above them,—disaffected to the powers that be,—constantly undermining our fine honoured institutions,—opposing every safeguard provided for the security of their country; of actively contrasting our beloved Queen with the American President, insulting her Royal Com-  
sout for upholding the noble-hearted life Volunteers, who are raising an imperishable rampart of defence around their native











Duke University Libraries



D00415684S

